

1. A 4105. dd
PRESERVATIVE

Against the
Principles and Practices

OF THE
NONJURORS

BOTH IN
Church and State.

OR, AN
A P P E A L

TO THE
Consciences and Common Sense
OF THE
CHRISTIAN LAITY.

By the Right Reverend Father in God
BENJAMIN, Lord Bishop of Bangor.

The Third Edition.

LONDON: Printed for JAMES KNAPTON, at the
Crown: And TIMOTHY CHILDS, at the *White-*
Hart, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1716.

Price One Shilling.

RESERVE

MONITOR

CLERK



THE PREFACE.

THE Subject of the Following Papers is made up of Three Parts. The First relates to our present Civil Establishment: And Endeavours to State the Cause, between the Protestant Branches of our Royal Family; and the Popish. The Second maintains the Right in All Civil Governments, to preserve Themselves against Persons in Ecclesiastical Offices; as well as Others. The Third concerns the very Vitals of True Religion: and is, in Truth, the Cause between Jesus Christ; and Those, who, professing Themselves His Followers and His Ministers, Substitute Themselves in His Place; and assume the Authority of their Great Legislator and Judge.

In the First Part, I have kept my self to what is of immediate importance to the Question, and avoided every Thing which might only serve to keep the Mind of the Reader from the Main Point. Particularly, I have neglected so much as to mention the Person, who pretends to be the Son of the late King James: or to concern my self, whether that King really had a Son; whether, if He had, That Son lived; whether This be He, or Another substituted in his room; and the like. And my Reasons are, because These Particulars are Matter of Dispute, between Him, and the rest of the Popish Line, full as much as between Him, and the Protestant Line; because the Controversy is (not between the Whole Protestant Line, and Him,

Him, but) between the Whole Protestant Line, and the Whole Popish Line; and because, the Right of our Present Establishment depending entirely upon the Right of Excluding the Whole Popish Line, it must suffer; I fear, by Excluding the Pretender alone, upon such Topicks, as manifestly serve to keep alive the Supposition of a Claim still rightfully lodged in the Other Branches of the Popish Line.

In the Last Part, the Greatest Satisfaction I have, (after having vindicated the Right of the Civil Power to all Necessary Self-Defense,) is, in declaring to All Christians their Right to look into the Gospel, themselves; to depend upon Christ alone for their Religion; and upon his Final Determination alone, for their Salvation; and, in the mean while, to esteem it a small Matter, to be judged of Man's Judgment: well knowing that Nothing but this Wide and Strong Foundation well laid, can effectually guard against those Schemes, or Platforms, of a Superstitious Tyranny, which may to some appear harmless at first; but from which, in truth, the whole Dreadful Fabrick of Popery hath, by degrees, grown up to its full Strength and Maturity.

Another Part may perhaps follow, in due time, if it be found necessary.

In the mean while, I have address'd This to the Christian Laity: because They must think Themselves infinitely concern'd in Every Part of it, if They have any Regard left for Themselves; their Estates; their Bodies; their Souls; their Children; and their latest Posterity.



A
PRESERVATIVE
 Against the
PRINCIPLES and PRACTICES
 OF THE
NONJURORS, &c.



AFTER near *Thirty Years* of such Patience and Indulgence, as was never yet experienced in any Nation of the World, by the Public and Avowed Enemies of it's Government ; The *Nonjurors* now at length think it time to open the *Scene*, for which They have been long preparing the Way, in a more cover'd and private manner. Whether They imagine that All the *Lenity* with which They have hitherto
 B been

been treated, hath been nothing else but *Fear* and a *Consciousness of Wrong*; or that their own Cause is for ever lost, if this *Crisis* of Time be not laid hold on; or that the *Passions* and *Madness* of Men, at this Time, have fitted Them for any Impressions: Whatever it be; The *Establishment* is now openly and directly charg'd with the Want of all Right. Their Cause is now publickly declared to be the Cause of God. The *Church* is made a principal part of the *Argument*. The words *Unity*, *Schism*, *Altar*, *Excommunication*, *Damnation*, and the like, are thrown about in such a manner, as to confound the Understandings of Honest Men of low Capacities; to excite the Rage of the Tumultuous and Wicked; and to be *Engines* of Destruction in the Hands of the Designing and Crafty, as well amongst *Profess'd Papists*, as *Others*.

In these Circumstances, I have a Mind, as far as I am able, to point out to You the true Way of judging of what They are now perpetually offering to You upon these Heads; to lead you to such *Principles* and *Maxims*, as will be found True in themselves; and easily applied to every Difficulty upon these Subjects, which is now, or may be, from time to time, thrown in your way. But then, I will endeavour to do this in such a manner, as to make it a lasting Foundation for you to go upon; and to lay down nothing, but what will effectually, and for ever, be of Service in this Cause. I will not, merely for a present Occasion, make use of any Arguments, which, in the Event, are

are the Great Strength of our *Enemies* themselves. I will not allow them, upon any Terms, that our present *Civil Establishment* is unlawful; or that *Lay-Deprivations* are invalid: because I know how impossible it is for *Those* whom they generally attack, to extricate Themselves out of the Consequences which are drawn from those Two Points. I will not go upon any *Precedents*, or Examples, of *Mere Submission*, either to *Civil* or *Ecclesiastical Governours*; because this again resolves itself into that Supposition. I will not be at all concern'd whether the *Jacobites*, remaining *Jacobites*, can be perswaded to frequent our *Churches*; because, I am indeed of the Mind of *Those* amongst Themselves, who thought their own Cause wou'd be better propagated, in that Method, than by an *Open Schism*. As for their *Souls*; I leave them in the Hands of that God, who sees their Hearts: and as for their *External Communion* with Us, whilst they retain their main Principles; I think it wou'd be of worse Consequence to the Publick Interest, than their Declared *Separation*. Nor shall I apply my self to any *Others*, merely upon the Foundation of their having taking the *Oaths* to the *present Government*: well knowing that the *Nonjurors* find an easy Account, in proving to any Men of common Understandings, that the having taken an *Oath*, which They are since perswaded They find reason to repent of, is no Argument for the *keeping* it; and that the best reparation They can make for it, when they come to judge it an *Unlawful* and *Wicked* Obligation, is to act contrary to it, as soon as possible.

I do not say this, to reflect at all upon any Other *Worthy Persons*, who think it fitting to take these Methods, Nor do I deny but that some *particular Persons* may possibly be kept by them, for the present, from joining Themselves to *Our Adversaries*. But even *this Good* cannot be certain and lasting, whilst the *Main Principles* of their Cause, are allowed to be Honourable and Righteous. Suppose, for Instance, a Person be perswaded that it is *barely lawful* to submit to a *De-Facto-Government*. *Interest*, or *Humour*, may make him for the present, *barely submit* to it. But as soon as the *Scale of Interest*, or *Humour*, is turn'd, this will not convince Him that He *must* so much as *submit* to it. It may still be true, that it is likewise *lawful* not to *submit* to it. Nay, It may be still true, that it is more Honourable, and Praiseworthy, to be faithful to that *Authority*, which is, *De Jure*, entitled to his *Subjection*. And this, I fear, is forgot in the mean while, that, for the *very Few* that may be kept from them, and that only for a Season, by such *Methods*, there are *very Many*, who are not only perverted, but strengthen'd ; and harden'd in their Adherence to them, by these, and the like *Proceedings*. At least, this is my Perswasion, from the Experience and Observations, which have come within my reach. I am sensible that *Others* may be wiser to see the Tendencies of Things, than I am : and every One is to conduct himself agreeably to his own Notions of such Matters. But I imagine that I have long seen, the Evil of cour-
ting

ting their *Principles*, as well as their *Persons* : And that if We will go on to speak and act, as if we were Conscious that They are in the Right Way, and Our selves in the Wrong ; We must not wonder, if They go on to draw such *Consequences* from our *Premises*, as naturally enough follow from them.

If therefore, I have resolved to avoid, or to deny plainly, some *Main Points*, it is because I think I am certain, that they are *false* in *Themselves* ; that they are the *Great Engines* of the *Popular Conversions* which our *Adversaries* make amongst the Unwary ; and that, after an *Experience* of near *Thirty Years* of the Insufficiency, and Bad Effect of *some Methods*, it cannot be *imprudent* to try *others* : In which, I promise my self that I shall at least have the Satisfaction of furnishing such Arguments as may preserve the *Good Disposition*, and increase the *Zeal*, of the Honest and Uncorrupted Part of the *Nation*. This alone I shall ever account no small Good. And if I may not hope to convince any of our *Adversaries*, or of *Those* who have been misled by them ; yet, I resolve to give them no other Offence, than what the *Principles* which I think my self obliged to maintain, and a sincere desire of doing Them Service, carry along with them.

The Way, therefore, I propose to go in, is, to look back to the first *Foundation*, upon which *We*, and Our *Adversaries* differ ; then, to observe the Steps and Degrees, by which Their Cause hath been kept alive ; and then, to Consider the present State of Things, with regard to *Church*
and

and State; the main *Topicks* which our *Adversaries* make use of; and the true Answers, as far as my Judgment reacheth, to what they chiefly rely upon.

The *Foundation* of our *Difference* is this. In the Year 1688. the Nation, the *whole Nation* of *Protestants*, (however past Danger at a distance may seem as nothing,) universally, and equally, felt and saw themselves upon the Brink of Destruction. The chief Men amongst Us, (not the *Greatest Churchmen* excepted,) invited over the Assistance of our Neighbours. After having warded off the present Threatning of Ruin, nothing remained but to secure Us from the Return of the same Evils of Popery and Slavery, made more terrible by the Revenge, which must then have come along with them. This was done, with the greatest Regard to the Constitution of the Kingdom, and with the least Deviation from the *Common Rule*. The *Popish Branches* of the Royal Family were set aside, upon no other Consideration than the Safety of the whole Nation. And the very first *Protestant Branches*, in the *same Royal Family*, were declared Heirs; and the *Succession* from Them declar'd and confirm'd, in the same Course as was usual before.

Upon the first Settlement of the Nation, after the *Abdication* of King *James*, some of the *Bishops*, and some also of the *Inferior Clergy*, (upon what Motives, or Considerations, I do not now enquire,) refusing to give the common Security of Faithfulness and Allegiance to the Go-

vernment

vernment, and declaring Themselves in the Interest of it's Enemies, were first *Suspended* from the Execution of their Offices; and then, after a delay of *Six Months*, *depriv'd* of their Offices, Benefices, Dignities, and Promotions Ecclesiastical: as the Words of the *Act of Parliament* express it.

From hence arose these *Two* main Principles: the *One*, that our Princes upon this *Protestant Establishment*, in exclusion to the *Popish Line*, can have no Right to the Crown; and the *Other* (very new, and never before heard of in the *Church of England*,) that No *Deprivation* of *Bishops* by the *Lay-Power* can be valid, or ought to be submitted to. And from these *Two Principles* arose *Two Points* of *Practice*. The *One*, The adhering to the *Popish Line*, and the Refusing as Unlawful, the taking *Oaths* of Fidelity to the *Protestant Establishment*: and the *Other*, the adhering to the Communion of the *Deprived Bishops*, and the treating our *Churches* as *No Churches*.

But it was not presently the Season of opening all this, in the face of the World. There was the less need of it, because every Year, and almost every Month, they lived in the confident Expectation of the Blessing of seeing their *King* restored to them by a *French Power*: And without this, the *Temper* of the Nation was not very quickly of that sort, as to give them much Encouragement to speak plainly. In the mean while, They saw with Pleasure, that many of those who took the *Oaths*, did it upon a Principle of *Reproach* to the *Government*, if not,
of

of Shame to Themselves: And that most of Those who defended both *that*, and the *Church* united with it, moved very faintly in their work; treated the *One*, as an *Usurpation*; and the *Other*, as what it was barely lawful for the *Laitie*, in imitation of former Precedents, to communicate with.

The *Glory* that was thus freely given them, They greedily snatch'd: and amongst Those, whom they had to deal with, They had little other Trouble, besides appealing to the Writings of their *Adversaries*, to shew that Their Principles were, in effect, acknowledg'd to be Just and Right. For when it could be shewn to the very Senses of their Followers, that Those who kept in the *Establishment*, did it as a thing barely lawful, but not over-honourable in their own Judgments; that, when They were obliged, in honour, to write, their whole Concern was to vindicate *Themselves* from the Imputation of *Dishonesty*, and not the *Government* from the heavy Charge of *Unjust*; to give Reasons for the bare lawfulness of *their own Compliance*, and to leave the *Establishment* not only undefended, but mark'd, by their own way of Treating it, with the Infamous Blot of *Usurpation* without true Right: I say, when this was so, in the Writings and Discourses of several of the most famous of *Those*, from whom the *Nonjurors* separated, They had too easy a Game to play; which They did not fail to manage in private, so as to add to the Number of their *Church*, Many of Those whose Capacities were not above the following of *Great Names*.
They

They never found, I am perswaded, any great Difficulty in making *Profelytes* of *Those*, whom They had once convinced of the Truth of their *Two Main Principles*: and, to do that, They found nothing more effectual than to add to their own Conclusions, the *Testimony* of *Those*, who not only allowed, but applauded their *Premises*. They met with very few, I dare say, of so nice a Discernment, and of so distinguishing a Head-piece, as to stand the shock of such Attacks as these ——— *Your own Friends treat the Government, as having no Right. And, if the Protestant Line hath no right, the Popish Line must have it. And consequently, it is at least more honourable, to adhere to that to which the Right belongs.* Again, in the *Church Controversy*, the Passage was easy from the former Argument, to engage Men to join with *Those*, who prayed for their *True King*. Besides that They could furnish the same *Testimony* for the Foundation of this also. Many of the Great Writers, on the Side of the *Establishment*, have gone upon the Supposition, and some openly acknowledg'd *Deprivations* by the *Lay-Power* to be invalid; and only pleaded against carrying the Matter to a *Separation* upon that Account. But certainly, they would argue, If *Lay-Deprivations* be *invalid*, then it is the greatest Presumption in the *Civil Power* to meddle with such Things; and the Duty of all to bear *Testimony* against so great an Evil, and to communicate with *Bishops* so unjustly and injuriously ejected. Or else, if they had a mind not to carry the general Principle so far, They might

C

draw

draw as strong an Argument from the Concessions and Principles of some who took the *Oaths*; and defended themselves, as taking *Oaths* to a *Government Usurped*. For they might well argue, that a Civil Power *without* Right, had no Authority to deprive Those *Bishops*; even supposing such an Authority to be lodg'd with the Rightful Civil Power. If we look back, therefore, We shall find, that by their flattering the Independent Rights of the *Clergy*, and exalting their Power; by crying up the Church in general, and treating the *other Dissenters* with Indignity; and the like Artifices; they first made their Way to the Love and Approbation of *Those*, whom They now treat as the Worst of Men; that having this Approbation and Concurrence of many of the *Clergy* in the *Main Points*, to produce for Themselves, they went on, gaining Ground, whilst They were look'd upon as Friends, by Those whose Congregations they now threaten with Damnation; that, by the help of such Supports from others, rather than their own Strength, They have proceeded from one Step to another; with an indefatigable Industry, scattering their Papers; and entering into the Art and Freedom of Conversation; till They are now come to think Themselves strong enough to stand without the Assistance of *Others*: nay, to turn their own *Artillery*, against *Those*, from whom They before borrowed it. These things I have the rather now reminded you of, not only to remark the Steps by which the Cause of Our *Adversaries* is come to the State in which it now is; but

but to vindicate, and justify, my present Design of opposing their way of Reasoning, upon another Foundation, and different Principles.

The *present State* of their Cause, is, You see, little more than the Result of what several of *Those* who have complied with the *Government* have either expressly granted to Them, or very faintly denied to Them. The Mask is now laid aside. They have now left off to flatter that part of the *Clergy*, to whom, I am perswaded, they owe the greatest Advantages of their Cause, Their Voice and Language is alter'd. *Excommunication* is declared against them. They are so far from being able, or qualified, to be *Ministers* in the *Church of Christ*, that They are not allowed to be Themselves, *in, or of, the Church*; but are given over to a State of Damnation. Those who join with Them, even tho' their Hearts are with the *Nonjurors*, are now terrified with the Thoughts of losing their Souls: Nay, and when They return to this True, Charitable, Christian Church, it is with much Difficulty, and bitter Repentance, and great Abhorrence of the crying Sin, of having communicated with any others, that They are received, and come to be esteem'd and acknowledg'd in the Number of the Faithful. And this is the Method now open'd, for the most effectual keeping their Ignorant and Unwary Followers, close to the other *Main Principle*, of the Injustice and Usurpation of the present *Protestant Establishment*.

My way of thinking in this Matter, I confess, is this. If there be a *Right* properly so called,

acknowledged to be still remaining in the *Popish* Line; and no *Right*, properly so called, in the *Protestant* Line now in Possession; it is a folly to go about to perswade any Man of a good plain Understanding, that it is not his most secure way to the favour of God, to adhere to that Side, on which this *Right* is. And again, If it be acknowledg'd, that Those *Bishops* were not lawfully *deprived*; it is a folly to go about to perswade Men to renounce their *Communion*, or to give any Encouragement to *Those*, who have *Usurp'd* their Place. The Remedy, I always judge, must be something equivalent to the *Root* of the Disease: If it be not so, it only binds it up a little for the present, to break out again more furiously and more dangerously in time to come.

I think it a very trifling part of this Controversy, whether They will please to come to our *Churches*, or not. I can't perswade my self to give Them the hard Names, They give even to Those who have befriended them; or, because I think *Them*, and their Followers, to be *mistaken* in this World, therefore to argue that They shall be *damn'd* in the next. But I think it of *Great Importance*, whether our Present Royal Family have a *True Right*, or not; Whether our *Churches* are *Christian Churches*, or not; Whether Those who communicate with us, have a Title to God's Favour, or not; and whether the Supreme Power of this Nation had not a *Right* to deprive the *Nonjuring Bishops*. As I am certain that They make *no Profelytes*, but by the
contrary

contrary Principles: so *These* must be the *Best Preservatives* against Them: And we must first destroy their *Foundation*, before We must expect, what They have built upon it, necessarily to fall to the Ground.

And having undertaken to give you the best Assistance I can, to lead you into a *True Answer* to what the *Nonjurors* are ever alledging in favour of their own Practice, both in *Church* and *State*: I must of necessity both begin where They always begin; and follow Them in their *Arguments*, as They lead the way. If They attack the present *Establishment* upon *Topicks*, which will lead to *Subjects* not agreeable to many amongst Us; it is not a *Fault*, but a *Duty* to the *Happy Settlement* We enjoy, to enter upon those *Subjects*, which it's Enemies make necessary to be handled.

I shall not do this out of choice; or with any Perswasion that it is the *Absolute Duty* of every private Subject to enquire into the *Right* and *Title* of the Government under which He lives: but because the State of our Nation is such, that They are almost all, daily and hourly, allarm'd against the *Right* of their present *Governours*, and alienated in their Hearts and Affections, by the setting up another *Right* opposite to it. So that, with Submission to better Judgments, I humbly conceive, that, tho' it might have been enough, in other Circumstances, to have reminded All *Subjects* of the general Duty of *Obedience*: yet, considering that there is a *Right* openly set up against our present *Royal Family*; and that the
 People

People are continually and universally led by our Adversaries to *judge* of that *Right* ; and are, by this Method alone, made *Enemies* upon *Principle* ; it doth not seem to be left to our choice, what Method to proceed in. It is an *Antidote* that is wanted : and that must be framed according to the *Nature* and *Extent* of of the *Poison*, dispersed abroad. It is in vain, to tell *People* of what is due to the *Supreme Civil Power*, if their *Minds* are distracted, and not at all satisfied, which is that *Supreme Power*. It is of no importance to King *GEORGE*'s Interest, to press the Duty of obeying the KING, upon Those who are every Day taught that *HE* is not their KING. It cannot indeed, be otherwise, but that the true Method of doing effectual Service to Our own Cause, must be the very *Opposite* to *That*, which our Adversaries have found most successful against it.

The *First Point* with Them, and that which stands them in most account, and that without which all their Other Arguments would have but little effect, hath always been, the Great and Crying Injustice of setting aside the *Popish Line*, and fixing the Succession to the *Crown*, in the *Protestant Branches* of the *Royal Family*. If they could not persuade weak Men, and *Women*, to this ; their *Schism* and their *Churches* would quickly disappear. And to persuade Them to this, They sometimes argue from the Declarations of *Scripture*, which They are pleased to interpret absolutely against throwing off our Duty and Allegiance

Allegiance to the late King *James*; and against any the least *Deviation* from the *Right Line* of the Popish Branches of the *Royal Family*: sometimes, (I should say, most commonly,) from the *peculiar Doctrine* of the *Church of England*: and sometimes from the *Constitution* of our *Government*: which they frame to Themselves to be so absolutely *Hereditary*, that the *Popish Branches* of the *Royal Family* could not *justly*, or *lawfully*, be set aside by any Power upon Earth.

I. In Answer therefore, to what any of them may allarm You with, concerning the Delarations of *Holy Scripture*; and the Consequences which They draw from thence: I desire nothing of You, but that you would neither believe *Them*, upon *their* bare Word, in their own Cause; nor *Me*, nor any One else, against it. But search with your own Eyes, and see, whether you can possibly find a plain and exprefs *Passage* of *Scripture*, in which God instituted any particular *Form* of *Humane Government*, for any Nation in the World; unless you will except *One*, which first wilfully and resolutely *Chose* it for Themselves: or, in which He commands all Nations, either to keep firm to that *One Form*; or, when once They have for any length of Time been under Subjection to a *Race* of *Princes*, that They are obliged, upon pain of Damnation, not to put by the next in Blood, even tho' the Destruction of the *Whole* be unavoidable without it. And remember, that it ought to be a very plain, and exprefs *Passage*, to found such a *Doctrine* upon.

When

When They allarm You with the *Declarations of Scripture*, about *Allegiance*, or *Obedience to Princes*; which They apply to the absolute Unlawfulness, and Crime, of withdrawing our *Allegiance* from King *James* to the *Revolution*; and from the *Popish Line*, since that time: desire Them impartially, and plainly at tell you, whether, in multitudes of other Cases, They do not explain the general Words of *Scripture* with those *Restrictions*, which the Nature and Circumstance of the thing spoken of, require, and justify; whether They do not allow, in many places, that where there are *Restrictions* express'd in Words, there must certainly be a *Restriction* or *Limitation* allowed; and whether it doth not follow from hence, that it must be resolved at last into this, whether the Nature of *Government* it self require these Expressions to be understood absolutely, or with *Restrictions*. And about this, I will here just mention one thing, of which I will make more use presently: That They themselves are forced to allow, that, in Cases of *Natural continued Folly*, or *Madness*, none of these *Texts* oblige a Nation to *Personal Obedience*. This is a *Demonstration* that the most strong and express of those *Passages*, which they think so favourable to Themselves, are not to be interpreted *absolutely*, or without any possible exception. With the help of this One Argument, you will always be able to answer what They pretend to alledge from the *Scripture*. Nor can They themselves deny but that the Directions there laid down, were only short General Rules, designed for the Use of such, as were

so weak as to think themselves exempt from all *Government*; and not at all with any view of binding down whole *Christian Nations* to utter Destruction.

II. When They speak much of the *Peculiar Doctrine* of the *Church of England*; answer Them, that it is a Scandal to the *Church of England* to suppose that it hath any *Peculiar Doctrines*, consider'd as the *Church of England*; that it knows no other *Rule*, but the *Gospel*, and always appeals to *that* for the *Truth* of every thing taught in it; that by the *Church of England*, in this, and the like Debates, is meant that *Collection* or *Company* of Men, who at, and quickly after the *Reformation*, settled our *Worship*, our *Articles*, and *Homilies*; that *These* not only were fallible Men, but, in One of the *Articles*, solemnly profess *Themselves* as well as *Others*; all *Churches* equally; all *General Councils* equally, so to be; and that in another *Article* They expressly require All in their *Communion* to take the *Scripture*, (and not *Them*) for the *Rule* of their *Faith*, and *Practice*; and that, consequently, the certain *Truth* of any *Doctrine*, is not put, by our *Reformed Church*, upon it's being the *Doctrine*, or the *Peculiar Doctrine*, of our *Church*, but of the *Scripture*.

But if Our *Adversaries* will be determin'd by the *Homilies* of the *Church*, as They would here make you believe, in order to catch you upon this Subject only, You may quickly satisfy your selves that there are many Arguments, and many plain Passages, in them, even upon this same Subject, which evidently condemn their whole

proceeding; besides multitudes of *other Doctrines*, *main Doctrines*, largely handled in the *Homilies*, which these *Great Churchmen* not only do not receive, but hold in the utmost contempt. Ask them therefore, Will you be determined, in *other Matters*, by the *Homilies* of the *Church*; and by the *Interpretations* of *Scripture* in *them*, for instance about *Justification*, *Faith*, *Antichrist*, *Musick* in *Churches*, and *Ceremonies* too; and in many other *Points*, upon which great stress is there laid? If They will not, (as I know, they will not,) They can never more expect you to yield up your *Assent*, in another *Point*, merely because They chance to like it, and think, They should gain by it.

Your *Answer* therefore, is plain before You. Supposing the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, to be plainly, in this particular Instance, on *their Side*; the *Church* it self requires You to be determin'd solely by the *Scripture*, whether it be *true* or not. And, again, Supposing this *Doctrine* to be as They represent it, You have the same liberty to differ from *this point*, which these Gentlemen themselves have in many *Others*, upon which equal Weight is laid. They, of all Persons living must never reproach You, till They can shew You, their *Scheme* of *Church-Authority*, *Sacerdotal Powers*, *Regular Successions*, *Authoritative Benedictions*, and *Absolutions*; or their *Notions* of many other *Points*, not to have been condemn'd even with Zeal by the *Church* of our *First Reformers*. But then again, this *Doctrine*, as They represent it, and profess to practice it, is not the *Express Doctrine* of the *Homilies*. The particular Case
of

of a *Total Destruction* is not there put: and nothing less than the putting that *Case*, can justify the interpreting All Other Expressions, absolutely, and inflexibly. And to convince Our *Adversaries* themselves of *this*, it is enough to remark that otherwise 'They themselves' differ equally from them, upon this very Subject: which perhaps they will be surprized to hear. The *Homilies* do not put the *Case* of *Lunacy*, or *Idiocy*, in a *Prince*. Ask them, therefore, Doth what They say, absolutely conclude for *Personal Allegiance*, and against the *Coertion* of a *Regency*, in such a *Case*? If *not*, as They allow; here is a *Demonstration*, that the *Doctrine*, however express'd, is not *Absolute*; and consequently, in *Cases* which *equally* affect the business of *Government*, equally admits of an *Exception*.

Nor need it move You, that They have presumed to declare this *particular Doctrine*, a *Heresy* determined by the *Church*, alledging that the *Compilers* of the *Homilies* have called it a *False and damnable Doctrine*. For supposing, (which indeed, is not true,) that the *Church* hath professedly and directly, spoke to the *Case*; 1. It is evident that *They* are self-condemn'd by this *Rule*, because they allow, in the *Case* of *Lunacy*, what equally contradicts the *Doctrine* of the *Church*; and so are equally Guilty of *Heresy*, as They themselves have stated it. 2. You may see plainly in another Instance, that they *say*, and *unsay*; *maintain* and *deny*, just as their own Cause requires: when *They*, who would have others declared *Hereticks*, by *Consequence*; yet will not

be content to be judg'd *Excommunicated* even by the Express Words, and Purpose, of a *Canon* of the same *Church*, which declares it in so many words against *All*, who deny the *King's Supremacy*: which They openly profess to be an *Usurpation* in *All Kings*. This will shew you that They only urge the *Authority* of the *Church* to over-bear *Others*; whilst they will not be determin'd by it themselves. 3. If it could be shewn that some of their own darling Principles are treated in the *Homilies* as *false* and *damnable*; (as I believe it may;) I am very sure, They would not think this the same, as if the *Church* had expressly Condemn'd them, under the Name of *Heresy*; nor acknowledge Themselves *Real Hereticks*, and their *Episcopacy*, and *Holy Offices*, affected by it, even if such an Express Condemnation had been passed. But, let us proceed.

III. As for our *Legal Constitution*; there are few of the *Nonjurors*, who do not prefer *Absolute Monarchy* before it. But *Some* of them do indeed sometimes mention it in their Arguments, because, by the seeming Contradiction of some of our *Statutes* to others, They think, They can confound the Understanding of the Unskilful. And for *Others* of them; as the *Papists*, by the *Church* established by Law, when they speak in it's favour, mean the *Popish Church* established by *Laws* made before the *Reformation*: so, They, play with the Word a little at their leisure, and by our *Constitution* mean, what it was, when they imagine our *Kings* to have been *Absolute*; and from thence conclude, no other Right to be in

our

our *Laws* but what hath flowed from their voluntary Concessions, and what may still, upon that Account, depend upon *their Wills*. I shall therefore, not enter here into any nice *Examination* of what You cannot so well judge of, but put you in mind of *something*, which flows from *General* and *Comprehensive Principles*; and which may be applied to *All Constitutions*; and to our own in particular, let it be, as They represent it, or not: *viz.* That, as the *By-Laws* of any *particular Corporation*, are always supposed to be agreeable, and subordinate, to the *Law* of the Land; or else to be *Invalid*: so, all *Constitutions* are under the *Universal Law* of God, and of *Humane Society*. And to apply this to Our *Adversaries*, in Your *Answers* to All that They will sometimes alledge out of our *Statutes*, against *Coercion*, or withdrawing *Allegiance*, or the like, there needs nothing, but to put you in Mind, that They themselves are forced to mollify all *Constitutions*; and particularly to add an *Exception* to the most *Rigid Statutes*, in our own, by allowing that a *Lunatick*, or an *Idiot*, may be *coerced*; put under the *Restraint* of a *Regency*; which is an *Effectual Exclusion* of Him from *Government*, and from All Right to the *Personal Allegiance* of his *Subjects*: and all this, merely because He is wholly incapable of answering the *Ends* of *Government*.

This Foundation, You see, is so plain, that All, even the most unwilling, acknowledge it, in the *Case* of *Idiocy*, or *Madness*. From hence You will furnish your selves with this *Argument*. As it is impossible, in the *Nature* of the Thing,
and

and by the *Confession* of our Adversaries themselves, that any *Constitution* of Government, or the most express *Declarations* of *Written Laws*, can be supposed to intend to impose upon any *Nation* the Indispensable Duty or Obligation, of paying *Obedience* or *Allegiance*, to an *Idiot*, or a *Madman*; and this solely, because the *Ends* of Government cannot, in any tolerable degree, be answer'd by Them: So, upon the same certain Foundation, Let the *Constitution* of a *Nation* be what it will; let it be from *God*, or from *Man*; Let the *Declarations* of the *Laws* be never so strong; They cannot be supposed to intend to oblige a *Nation* to their own utter Destruction, in any parallel Case; to forbid whatever is necessary for the Preservation of the whole; to take away, or to give up, their *Right* to set aside, in the Best manner the Circumstances of Affairs allow, all such *Persons*, as are equally incapable of answering the *Ends* of Government, in a tolerable degree, and therefore, in the same Rank, upon that Account, with *Idiots*, or *Lunatics*; and to invest the *Authority* in others. The *End* of Government is acknowledg'd the sufficient only Reason for setting aside *Lunatics*, or *Idiots*: and therefore, the same *End* of Government holds equally in all parallel Cases. And as the *Argument* from hence, is of that Nature, that you may securely depend upon it: so, It will be of Great Use therefore, thoroughly to apprehend it, and constantly to have recourse to it; because Our *Adversaries* themselves are forced, against their Will, to resolve all into this, even the Highest supposed

supposed *Case* of God's Instituting *Monarchy* absolutely *Hereditary*; and in their interpreting Passages of *Scripture*, which yet, at other times, they would force upon others as *Absolute Rules*, without Exception; and much more must do it, in their *Appeals* to our *Church*; or our *Constitution*.

The *main Point*, necessary to make All this, which is true in it self, useful to Us, in this Debate, is to consider, Whether what hath been done in this *Nation* can be justified upon this Foundation: that is, in other words, whether the setting aside the *Popish Line*, be not in Truth, setting aside a *Line* of *Princes* incapable of answering the *Ends* of *Government*, in our Nation. The Consequence of which was, going no farther from the *strait Line*, than to the *nearest Protestant Branch* in the same *Royal Family*.

Now, *All Incapacity* is the same, in the Effects and Consequences of it, to the Concerns of a Nation. It is of no Importance, whether it be *Natural*, or *Moral*. If therefore, you doubt of the *Incapacity* of the *Popish Line* for our Government: Reason and Experience will soon convince You. In *Reason*, You will see it plain, that any *Prince*, who hath *Principles* in Him, that oblige Him, in point of *Conscience*, to destroy Us, is incapable to preserve, and make Us happy. But a *Prince* fully possess'd by the *Popish Religion*, is under the Command of *Principles*, which teach Him that it is his *Duty* to destroy Us. And, therefore, must have the greatest of *Incapacities*. I say, The Greatest of All. For

an *Idiot* may be kept quiet. A *Lanatick* may be controll'd, without incurring Censure for it. But One, who is not supposed to be out of his own Governance, and yet is a *Bigot*, perfectly under the Influence of such a Religion, is by that means free from the Restraint of others; at liberty to follow his own Counsels, and obliged by them to destroy *All* that stands in the way of those Counsels.

Go to the *Experience* of *Other Nations*; and that will shew You, there never was a *Popish Prince* over a *Protestant People*, who did not make good this Observation. Return to *your own*; The *Histories* will tell You, what *Queen Mary the First* was, under the highest Obligations to *Protestants*: and the Memory of Your selves, or of Many others now alive, will tell your what the late *King James* was, under the same, or greater Obligations to the *Body of Protestants* in this *Kingdom*; and under the *Additional Obligation* of the most solemn Promises. He, who set up in Himself, the *One Comprehensive Principle*, of a *Right* to dispense with our Laws at his pleasure, was *incapable* of our Government by Laws. It was not any *One particular Action*, but the Tenour of his *Actions*, and this *Avowed Principle* which convinced the *Nation*, and all Orders, Degrees, and Parties, of *Protestants* in it, of His *Incapacity*. If any of the *Nonjuring Bishops* were now remaining, You might ask them, Why they themselves set their Hands to the Invitation of the *Prince of Orange*, and his *Army*; which could be upon no other Bottom, but that they had found

found King *James* incapable of Governing this Nation. For if He were *capable*; there was no need of an *Army* of Directors and Advisers. You may ask *Those*, who were for setting up a *Regency* over Him, whether *That* was not a plain *Confession* that He was *incapable* of the Government. For it is an Insult upon common Sense, to go to persuade the World that He would, in *that* way, have been any more *King*, in effect, than He was, when He was declared to have *Abdicated*. So that *All*, You see, conspired; as well *Those*, who took the *Oaths* afterwards to King *William*, as *Those* who refused them; to declare and acknowledge that unhappy *Prince* to be as truly *Uncapable* of Governing this Nation, as if He had been an *Idiot*, or a *Lunatick*,

Now, I beseech you, what was it that was his *Incapacity*? What was it, that had satisfied *All* in general, (*Churchmen*, especially, I may say) at that Time, that He was *incapable*? His Natural Temper, His Moral Accomplishments, were in themselves no worse than those of many other *Princes*. No, It was his *Religion*, that gave Them their bad Turn. It was his *Religion* only, which made Him *incapable*: His being of a *Religion*, which, when it is fully possess'd, obligeth and prompts its *Votaries*, to destroy and ruine *Us*, and Our *Laws*.

And this being so plain from *Experience*, that They themselves, who now differ from *Us*, in effect acknowledg'd this *Incapacity* in King *James*, arising from his *Religion*, at a time when They were much better Judges of it, than They can be now: the next Point is, whether it be not as plain, that the same *Religion* produceth the same

Incapacity, in Others who heartily embrace it. Now this, I think, is evident from hence, that the *same Cause* must have the *same Effect*, where there is nothing to hinder it. *Popery* is a *Religion*, which, wherever it is receiv'd, must act, universally and equally, in the same way. It is a *Religion*, which leaves nothing to *Variety* of *Tempers*, or *Principles*; but layeth the *same Necessity* up *All* Those who receive it, either to sacrifice all the World to it, or to be sacrificed to it themselves. It is the *same Religion*, in all its extent and latitude, which obliged that *King* to be *Uncapable*, who without it might have been very *capable*. And therefore, the *Incapacity* in *Him*, having arisen solely from his *Religion*; the same *Incapacity* must arise from the same *Religion*, in *Others*: because there can be no difference in the *Obligations* which it lay'd upon *Him*, and those it must lay upon any of his *Successors*.

The *same Cause*, which obliged *King James* to attempt to ruine *Us*, as it is the *same*, must lay the *same Obligation* upon all others in his *Circumstances*.

But that was his *Religion* alone.

Therefore *that* alone must have the *same Effect* upon *Others*, embracing it, as He did.

Nor can any *Promises*, or *Vows*, to the contrary, alter the Case. That, *Experience* also shew'd in *Him*; and the same *Religion* which obligeth to *Our Destruction*, permits and engageth it's *Votaries*, to Swear, and Promise, the contrary.

This therefore, is the *Incapacity*; as certain, and as destructive, as any *Natural Madness*. And if it be lawful to guard against the latter *Incapacity*;

city; it must be so, to guard against the former: the Reasons being at least equally strong in both Cases. Nothing, therefore, remained for the Nation to do, but to take one of these Two ways. Either, to try, after one another, every *Individual Papist* in the *Royal Family*, in his Turn, free from All Restraint; or else, at once to *Exclude Them* from the Throne, either *without* the Ceremony of a *Perpetual Regency*: or *with* it: which alters not the Case. For such a *Regency* is in truth the same *Exclusion*: only a greater Deviation from the real Nature of our *Constitution*; and, in all probability, a more fatal Wound to it, in the End. It is indeed making a *Succession* of *Regents*, truly and properly *Kings*; an entire departure from the *Royal Family*: And, if you can without a Smile suppose that *Scheme* to have taken place, for All the *Papish Branches*, who either *All*, or *None*, require it; It is either an Alteration of the *Kingdom* from *Hereditary* to *Elective*; or a *Translating* it entirely from the *Royal Family* to a *Family* of *Subjects*; who will not be so weak as ever to part with what *Others* have been so weak, as to bestow upon Them.

Now, as to the *former* of the *Two Ways* just mentioned, it is as Absurd, as it would be to take a *Succession* of *Persons*, one by one, whom You have all the Reason in the World to believe equally *Lunaticks*; only in order to satisfy your Curiosity, whether the same Degree of *Madness* will have the same Effect, in *All* of them; and so to play with the Fate of a *Nation*: which too certainly will be ruined by some One or Other of these, before You can lock them up, or procure a Force to tie their Hands. Nothing therefore remained, but

the other : *viz.* To declare All Those to be equally Incapable, who really are so; and to try no more terrible Experiments with the Lives and Liberties of a Whole Nation, and of all their Posterity.

Here then, is the *Argument*, which You may securely use against the vain Attacks of Our Adversaries, upon the Protestant Succession: let the Attack, be from *Scripture*; or from what They please——.

They themselves, You may tell them, acknowledge that *Natural Madness* is a good and sufficient Reason for excluding the next Heir, or Heirs, from Government; or, which is all one, for putting a Nation out of their Hands, into those of a Regency: the only Ground of which is, that Madness renders the Man incapable of answering the Ends of Government, and disposeth Him to overthrow and contradict Them in the Tenour of his Conduct.

Now, the *Popish Religion*, We know by many Experiments, as well as from its profess'd Nature, and Tendencies, and unalterable Obligations, is equally an Incapacity, in this Protestant Nation.

Therefore, it is equally, and with as much Justice, a Reason for putting under a Regency, or which is all one, Excluding, the Next Heir, as any Lunacy can be.

And, because, it is not accidentally Bad in One Person; but, in it's own Nature, equally and effectually working, in one Uniform manner, in All who are possess'd by it: it is therefore, the same undeniable Reason for putting under a perpetual uninterrupted Regency, that is, Excluding,
All

All Papists, as it is for excluding *One* who hath been tried; or, as it hath been allowed to be, for putting *Him* under a *Regency*, which is, in effect, the same thing, as to *His Government*.

This is the *Exclusion*, to which this *Nation* hath been Witness: and it hath been effected, in the most *Regular* manner, which the *Circumstances* of the *Nation* could possibly permit: and with such a *Regard* to the *Royal Line*, that the *very next Protestant*, in the same *Royal Family*, is declared *Heir* to the *Crown* of these *Realms*; that is, the *very Next* in the *Royal Line*, after *Those*, whose *Government* is, morally speaking, inconsistent with the *possibility* of the *Publick Safety*. *Necessity*, *Reason*, *Prudence*, *The Nature of Humane Society*, *The Ends of Government*, *The Voice of God* ever approving these *Great Arguments* all conspired to promote, and to justify, what was done. Nothing indeed could have justified the not doing it: Nor could *They*, who had it in their *Power*, ever have answer'd to *Themselves*, or their *Posterity* the neglect of so great an *Opportunity*. But, blessed be *God*, it was done: And it was done in such a *Manner*, as that *We* can look back upon it with *Pleasure*, as upon a *Transaction*, in which the *Honour of God*, and the *Interest of a Brave People*; *The Liberty of the Nation*, and the *Preservation of our Religion*; are all concern'd: in which, a *Zeal for Publick Good* acted so noble a *Part*; declaring, and asserting a *Right* to the present *Possession* of our *Illustrious Prince* and *His Heirs*, full of *Honour* and *Glory* to *Themselves*, as well as of the most *Kindly* and *Benign Influences* upon the *Happiness* of their *Subjects*.

I cannot but hope that what I have now said, and particularly this last *Argument*, drawn from the *Incapacity* of *Papists* to Govern this Nation, is so convincing, that I need add no more Words to prove that the setting aside a *Line* of *Princes*, as incapable of answering the *Ends* of *Government* in this *Kingdom*, as any *Lunatics* could be, carries along with it *Right*, and *Authority*, properly so called; is agreeable, or rather absolutely necessary to the *Ends* of *Government*; and therefore, certainly approved of, by *God*. The *Consequence* of this, (allowed by *All*, who allow the *Other*,) is the present *Happy Settlement* in the *Next Protestant Heirs*: which I wish no longer to see treated, by Any who Swear to it, as an *Usurpation*; or *Mere Possession*; to be touched gently, and to be talk'd of as a Matter hardly defensible, and what one had better be ashamed of, than pretend to vindicate; but as a Matter to be Boasted of, by *All* who are concern'd in it; as what is founded upon the *Highest Right*, and the *Plainest Reason*, and can be supported by such *Evidence*, as nothing can shake.

I am sure, for my own Part, I have impartially turn'd it over and over again in my Thoughts; I have tried all the *Objections* against it, that I can think of; and I am more and more satisfied, that it hath all the *Demonstration*, in the way of *Political Truth*, which any *Geometrical Proposition*, hath in the *Mathematicks*. The *Ideas* are as clear; and the *Connexion* as visible: And, if such *Evidence* do not give the *Highest Right*, properly so called, to the *Illustrious House* of *Hanover*; it is impossible to tell what *Right* is; or what the difference is between

between *Right*, and *No Right*: A *Right*, I say, to their present *Possession*, thus plainly founded upon the *Necessities* of the Nation, the Preservation of it's *Government*, it's *Laws* and *Liberties*; and voluntarily declared, and consented to, over and over again, by the *Representatives*, truly so called, of the *People*; I mean of *Both* those *Parties*, into which it is our *Unhappiness* to be divided.

You see then, that there was a *Right*, to set aside King *James* the *Second*, and the *Claims* of the whole *Popish Line*, arising from their being utterly incapable of answering the *Ends* of *Government*. There was the same *Right* to provide farther for our *Security*. The *Princess* of *Orange* therefore, was declared *Queen*: and with Her was joined, in the *Regal Authority*, the *Prince*, Her Husband; with Her *Consent*, and that of the *Princess* of *Denmark*: as it was necessary, for the perfecting the *Great Work*, He had begun. King *William* and *Queen Mary*, being vested with the *Rightful Power* of *King*, and *Queen*; I should now go on to argue, that the whole *Legislative Authority* had a *Right* to *Deprive* the *Bishops* and *Clergy*, who at that time refused to give the necessary *Securities* for their *Allegiance*; and maintain'd the *Popish Claim* to the *Crown* still, against that *Government*. But because, since that time, the *Nonjurors* have not thought fit to be content with denying the *Right* of that *Government*; but, (in order to flatter *Those*, whom They meant to deceive to their own destruction, with an *Absolute Independency* upon the *State*,) have espoused and propagated a *General Principle*, against All *Lay-Deprivations*; never heard of before in this

Establish'd

Establish'd Church ; nor known, at that time, as far as appears, by those very *Deprived Bishops* themselves : I must therefore, follow them, *first*, in their *General Doctrine* ; and *then*, in all their terrible Consequences, about *Schism*, and *Damnation*, by which they affrighten Those, whom They could not move perhaps by their other *Arguments*.

This is the *Second Main Branch* of my Design. And here it will be proper for You, *First*, to know, the Nature, and Extent, of the *Deprivation* here spoken of ; and *Then*, to consider, in a more general way, whether this Power doth not, of Necessity, and in the Nature of the thing, belong to the *Supreme Rightful Authority* of a *Nation*.

Before I enter upon the *First* of these, (under which I propose to shew that this *Deprivation* of the *Bishops* was enacted to extend to all Parts, to which the *Supreme Authority* reacheth, and not only their *own Dioceses*,) it will be proper to remark that the *Advocates* of the *Nonjurors* contend against *All Deprivation* by the most *Rightful Supreme Power*, with a View always to the *particular Dioceses* of *Bishops* ; founding their Arguments upon their particular *Relation* to their *Dioceses* ; and denying to the *Supreme Power*, all Right of dissolving that *Relation* : because *this*, being all with regard to the Cause of our *Deprived Bishops* in particular, (upon whom Their own Conduct entirely depends,) may furnish Us with an *Observation* or *Two*, of some Importance. For here, it ought to be consider'd what our *Constitution* is, under which *These Bishops* accepted their *Episcopal Dignities* ; and what They themselves had acknowledged upon this Subject. And

And indeed, as to this particular *Branch* of our *Constitution*, it is manifest that, whatever *Power*, or *Authority*, is confer'd upon *Bishops*, by *Spiritual Persons*, at their *Consecration*; yet the *Right* of executing, or exercising this, in their *particular Dioceses*, ariseth originally from the *Nomination* of the *King*. This *Nomination* is vested in the *Crown*, by the *Laws*; and is ultimately resolved in the *Supreme Authority* of the *Nation*. Consequently, therefore, as They allow that what is *given*, may be *taken away*, by the *same Authority*; the *Right* to execute the *Episcopal Office* in a particular *Diocese*, coming, in our *Constitution*, from the *Civil Power*, may be taken away, upon great *Occasions*, by the *same Supreme Power*.

The *Point* here is not, whether this be *Right*, and *Fitting*: But whether *This* were not, in fact, Our *Constitution*, when the *Deprived Bishops* were first vested with their *Ecclesiastical Authority*; and acknowledged so to be, by *Themselves*. One need not appeal to *Them*, if any of them were living. All the *World* knows that *They* themselves had, upon their *Knees*, solemnly and devoutly acknowledg'd, that *They had, and held their Bishopricks, and the Possessions of the same, entirely, as well the Spiritualities, as Temporalities thereof, only of the King's Majesty, and of the Imperial Crown of this His Majesties Realm*. This *They* had solemnly sworn: And by the *Spiritualities*, nothing less could be meant than the *Relation* between *Them*, and the *Church*, or *Christian Clergy* and *People*, of that *Diocese*, to

F

which

which the King had nominated Them. From hence it follows, that the *New-invented* General Principle of the *Nonjurors*, cannot possibly help the Cause of *Those Bishops*, who, by their own solemn Acknowledgment, could not but believe, (whatever they thought of the Power then in Possession,) that the *Rightful Civil Power* was vested with sufficient Authority to *deprive* them : Because, whatever They believed Themselves to hold solely from that *Civil Power*, They could not but believe, They might be *deprived* of, by the same *Civil Power* : That is, according to their own *Solemn Oath*, the *Spiritualities*, as well as *Temporalities*, of their *Respective Dioceses*. To return,

I. As to the *Nature*, and *Extent*, of the *Deprivation* here spoken of ; *these* will appear most plainly, by setting down the very Words of the *Act of Parliament*, by which this particular *Deprivation* now spoken of, was *Enacted* : And They are these. *And be it further Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, that if any Arch-Bishop, or Bishop, or any other Person now having any Ecclesiastical Dignity, Benefice, or Promotion, shall neglect or refuse to take the Oaths, by this Act appointed to be taken, in such a manner as by this Act is directed, before the first Day of August, in the Year One thousand, six hundred, eighty nine, every such Person and Persons, so neglecting or refusing, shall be, and is, and are, hereby declared and adjudged to be suspended from the Execution of his or their Office, by the space of six Months, to be accounted from the said first day of August ; and if*
the

the said Person, or Persons, (so having neglected or refused,) shall not within the said six Months take the said Oaths in such manner, Court or Place, as they ought to have taken the same before the said first day of August; Then He or They shall be ipso facto deprived, and is, and are hereby adjudged to be deprived of His and Their Offices, Benefices, Dignities, and Promotions Ecclesiastical.

The first Point here to be observed is, That, upon their first refusal, They were Suspended from the Execution of their Office for six Months, that is, from the Exercise of their Function, every where, where They could with any Right exercise it before; and every where equally, where their Exercise of it would equally affect the Civil Government: The Design of the Act being to guard against Them, in every Part of the Nation equally. From hence therefore, it appears that, upon their Final Refusal, their Deprivation was designed and enacted to be likewise a Total Deprivation from the Exercise of their Office, where-ever the Authority of the Supreme Power extended it self. For it is absurd to suppose that the Final Deprivation was not to extend it self as far, as the former Suspension, which was but for a Term: Both being intended for the same Purpose. Nay, the very Words of the Act declare Them to be Deprived from their Offices, as well as their Dignities, &c. This then is the Deprivation here spoken of, A Deprivation from that Right to Execute their Office, or exercise their Function, which They once had: And this, ex-

tended to All Parts of the Nation equally. To suppose the contrary; *viz.* that this *Deprivation* reached only to *their own Dioceses*, but that They might still, by some Means, or other, execute their *Offices*, in all Parts of them, in any or All *other Dioceses*, except their own; is to suppose the *Act* made in *jest*; and so, as to destroy its own Intent, By Enacting that These Persons should have no Right to attempt to disturb, or ruine, the Nation, in *their own Dioceses*; but might disturb, and endanger it, as much as They pleased, in All other Parts of the Nation.

I have remark'd this, chiefly with a View to that *Notion*, that this *Deprivation* by the *Supreme Power*, took not away from the *Deprived Bishops* their *Right* to execute the several Parts of the *Episcopal Office*, in any other Parts of the Nation, except their *own Dioceses*: From whence it will follow likewise, that any *Minister* of a *Parish* was *deprived*, by this *Act*, from officiating, only in *one* particular *Parish*; but that He had still remaining in Him, notwithstanding the *Civil Power*, the *Right of Officiating*, in *all other Parishes* of the *Kingdom*, where He could procure a *Permission*, or *Connivence*, from any *Bishop*. This, I confess, is not the *Plea* of the *Nonjurars* themselves, who never permit Themselves even to make the *Supposition* of *Any Right* in the *Civil Power* to deprive a *Bishop* from his *Office*, tho' it be within the Limits of his own *Diocese* only: But of *Some* who professedly, and, I dare say, very sincerely, oppose them. But, as this is so far from defending the particular *Deprivation* by that *Act* of *Parliament* here

here spoken of, that it doth, in Truth, unwarily destroy the whole Intent of it ; and leave the *Supreme Power* really destitute of all *Self-Defense* against *Those*, who might by this Allowance effectually ruine it : I hope, upon these Accounts, I shall not be censur'd for endeavouring to defend the *Deprivation*, as it is in Fact, and as it ought to be, in my own Judgment, for the answering the *Ends* of it, in any tolerable Degree. It is that *Act* of the *Supreme Power*, which is the Point in question. I find, both from the *Words*, and from the *sole Intent* of those particular Clauses in it relating to this Matter, that the *Suspension*, and *Deprivation*, were *from the Execution of the Office*, in All parts of the Nation equally. I think nothing less than this, would have been of any Importance to the *Nations* Security : And therefore, it is *this*, which I am concerned to *justify*, in the best manner I can.

But here, as I pass, I can't forbear to take notice of what appears to be the *Prejudice*, which gives the *first* wrong Impression, and *first* leads Men's Thoughts out of the Way, upon this *Subject* : And that is, the Notion of *Something* in this Matter which the *Supreme Power* cannot *take away*, because it neither could, nor did, *give* it. It is enough here to put *Those* in Mind, who, by confining the *Deprivation* here spoken of, leave much more to the *Deprived Bishops*, for the endangering the *State*, than they will allow the *Act* to take from Them, that the same way of arguing will destroy even their own Design, and give back to the *Deprived Bishops*,
that

that little also, which They *seem* willing should be taken from them.

They say, They are *deprived* of their *particular Relation* to their *particular Bishopricks*; and consequently of their Right to perform their Offices in them. But not of their *General Right* to execute the *Episcopal Office* in other Places, Because what the *Civil Power* cannot give, it cannot take away. But I would beg that it might be consider'd that the *Bishops* Right to exercise their *Spiritual Powers*, in their own particular *Dioceses*, can no more be taken away, if this Reasoning be good, than the Exercise of them in other parts of the Nation. If this *Right* be entirely *Spiritual*, and conferr'd solely by *God*; it must be allowed to be equally so, both with relation to a particular *Diocese*, and to the other Parts of the Nation. For I suppose No One maintains this *Right* to execute their Office, to be a *Composition*, made up of Two Parts; the One *Spiritual*, conferr'd upon Them by a *Spiritual Authority* for all other Parts of the Nation; and the Other, of a *Civil Nature*, conferr'd by the *Civil Authority*, for their own *Dioceses*. Consequently, If They may lawfully be deprived of this *Right*, in *their own Dioceses*; they may as lawfully be deprived of it, in *Others*: And again, If They cannot lawfully be deprived of it in *All others*, because this *Right* is of a *Spiritual Nature*, and not conferr'd by the *Civil Power*; then, *not* in their own; which yet is contended for. For the *Argument*, being drawn from the *Nature* of the *Right*, and the Inability

Inability of the *Civil Power* to take away, what it did not give, holds as strongly against the taking it away in one place, as in another. They therefore, cannot but allow of a *Total Deprivation*, as to the *Right of Executing the Office*, who maintain the Rightfulness of that *Partial Deprivation* which They allow to extend justly throughout a particular *District*, or *Diocese*. This appears more plainly, in the Case of *Parochial Ministers*. For how unreasonable, and, in truth, how insignificant, is it to say, that the *Civil Power* may indeed deprive a Man from the *Right of Executing his Office* in his own *One Parish*; but hath no Authority to deprive Him of it, any where else; but, notwithstanding any thing the *Civil Power* can do, He may do what Mischief He can, in the Execution of his Office, in all other *Parishes*, but his own. The same holds exactly in the Case of more, or less, extended *Deprivations of Bishops*.

If this, therefore, be the *Argument*, that the *Civil Authority* cannot take away *Spiritual Powers*, which it never gave; or make any Person totally cease to be a *Bishop*; there are *Two Ways*, I think, of satisfying those *Worthy Persons*, who argue in this manner. For, first, if They would attend to it, They would find that the *Deprivation* of Greater Extent is no more the *taking away of Spiritual Powers*, than the other; and that the *Deprivation* from a Right to execute the *Episcopal Office*, in *All Dioceses*, and Parts of the *British Dominions*, makes the Man no more totally cease to be a *Christian Bishop*, than the same sort of *Deprivation*

privation confined to his own former *Diocese*; no more totally takes away the *Episcopal Character* than the Other. This will appear more clearly, if we put the *Case* of one of these *Bishops, Deprived*, as is here said, from his *Office*, only in his own particular *Diocese*; and still living within the Bounds of that *Diocese*: which was indeed the Case of *Bishop Frampton*. For, If He still remains a *Christian Bishop*, in that *District*, within the Bounds of which He is rightfully *debarr'd* from his *Office*; then, the *Deprivation* from the *Execution* of his *Office* within those Bounds, doth not make him cease to be a *Christian Bishop*, even *within* Those Bounds. Consequently, neither will a more extended *Deprivation*, make Him cease to be a *Christian Bishop*, though it deprive Him of the *Right* of executing his *Office* all over the *Nation*: because a *Deprivation*, extended throughout a whole Country, can have no other Effect, or Consequence, in the whole, than a *Deprivation*, confined to any one Part of it, can have, in that *one* Part. This may help to shew, that there is no *Real Difference*, as to this Point, in *Deprivations* of a larger, and of a smaller Extent.

But in truth, neither in the *One*, nor the *Other*, doth the *Lay-power* concern it-self at all with the *Powers*, or *Capacities*, within: but only takes care that They shall not be exerted to the Hazard of the *Publick* committed to its Care. And if it be *lawful* for the *Safety* of the *Publick*, to *deprive*, or *bind*, from the *Execution* of *Spiritual Offices*, within a particular

Diocese

Diocese, or a particular *Parish*; as is here allowed: it cannot but be equally *lawful*, to *deprive* from the Execution of the same Offices, in *All Dioceses*, and All Parts of the Kingdom, if the same Safety of the Whole equally require it. And that it doth equally require it, is as evident as possible; both from the Nature of the Thing; and from the Practice and Principles of our *Nonjurors*.

But again, *Secondly*, Supposing that either in the *One*, or *Other*, or *Both* of these *Deprivations*, Total and Partial, it should be implied, that the *Civil Power* takes away, what it never gave; it is worth while to remark, that *this* is no manner of *Argument* against the *Rightfulness* of the *Thing*: as appears plainly in the Case of *Property* and of *Life* itself. It is evident that, in the nature of the thing, *private Property* is before the Institution of a *Settled Government*: because the great End of that *Institution* is the preservation of that *Property*. It is not *Given*, but *secured*, by the *Civil Powers*. But the *Civil Power* can by force, and by right, take away the Part, or the Whole, of the *Property* of particular Members, when that becomes absolutely necessary for the Safety of the *whole*. And so, can *take away*, what it *never gave*. The same may be said exactly as to *Life* itself: which the *Civil Power* rightfully takes away, (tho' it never gave it,) for the Good of the *whole*. From hence it follows, that Tho' the *Right* to exercise an *Ecclesiastical Office* be not supposed to come, in the least degree, from the *Civil Power*; yet it may be taken away by the *Supreme Civil Power*,

G

just

just as *Life*, and *Property*; and upon the same *Account*, viz. if the continuance of it be inconsistent with the *Safety* of the *Whole*: and this, not by any *Spiritual Power*, but by a *Right* inherent in it, and inseparable from it, to guard the *Society* from being undone by *Ecclesiastical Officers*, as well as by *Lay-men*.

But if, notwithstanding All this, Any Persons will contend that the *Supreme Power*, even supposing it to be *Rightful*, cannot *deprive*, *debar*, or *hinder*, (for we do not dispute about the *Words*, but the *Thing*,) its profess'd Enemies from *Executing* their *Spiritual Offices*, in such Sense, but that there will still remain, in the *Bishops*, and *Clergy*, so deprived, a *Right*, properly so called, to execute their Offices, as They shall judge fit; I shall only add, that They who think thus, will find it very hard to prove that They themselves have any *Right*, either to blame the *Nonjurors* for doing what, according to *Themselves*, They have a *Right* to do; or, to join with *Those*, who have been set up in opposition to *Their Bishops* and *Clergy*, whom They thus acknowledge to have had a *Right* to execute their several Offices, even to the manifest hazard of the *Publick*; and a *Right* not to be controll'd by that *Right* which the *Supreme Power* hath to All Things necessary for its own *Defense*, and *Preservation*.

You will by this time see plainly, from what hath been said, that the *General Scheme* of our present *Nonjurors*, is a *New-invented Engine* of courting Some amongst Us to their own Ruine; never thought of, nor believed, at the time of their

their *Deprivation*, by those very *Bishops*, in whose Cause it is so much pleaded ; and, if we may judge by what They had solemnly declared, probably abhorred by *Them*. All the *Argument* which *They* could make use of, in this *Case* was The want of *Authority* in the *Civil Power* then in possession : But not, the want of *Authority* in the *Civil Power*, supposing it to be the *Rightful Power*. And, as to *that* Matter, I think, I have shewn you that the *Supreme Civil Power* then in possession, had as plain, and evident a *Right*, as the *Eternal Law* of God can give to any *Government*.

You see likewise that the *Controversy* is now turn'd to that *General Principle*, which denies this *Right*, as much to the most *Rightful Civil Power*, as to the most *Unrightful*.

Having therefore now, as I pass'd, remark'd what was our declared *Constitution*, ever since the *Reformation* ; and known and acknowledg'd so to be, by Those very *deprived Bishops*, who are greatly injur'd by this *New Defense* of their *Followers* ; and having shewn you, from the very *Words* of the *Act of Parliament*, the *Nature* and *Extent* of the *Deprivation* Enacted by it ; I am now much more willing,

II. To speak of it, with a general View to *All Civil Power* ; because this will most effectually answer All the Pretenses of our Adversaries ; and to shew you, if I can, where the *Truth*, and where the *Fallacy* lies, in this Part of the *Debate* :

which now gives us leave to suppose the *Civil Power* to have all the *Right possible*.

What I have to say will rest upon this uncontested Principle: that *every Civil Government, hath a Right to every Thing necessary for its own Defense, and Preservation.* The Gospel hath not made the least *Alteration*, either in the *Pretensions*, or *Rights*, of *Civil Governments*. From whence therefore, will follow another *Main Point*, That *no Powers given by the Gospel to any of its Ministers, can include any Thing in them, inconsistent with the Safety and Preservation of the Civil Government.* These are so certain *Maxims*, and so allowed by All; that, whatever *Powers*, or *Privileges*, are claim'd by any *Ecclesiastical Persons*, contrary to these, let them be what they will, must be *Groundless*, and founded upon certain *Mistakes* and *Misrepresentations* of *Scripture*. The *Arguments* therefore, which, I am well assured, will never fail you, in this *Controversy*, are These, which follow. And, however our *Adversaries* may disturb, or confound you, with *Hard Words*, and *Long Stories* of *Transactions* of *Weak Men*, in several *Ages*, which it is easy to alledge equally on each side of every such *Question*; and which, therefore, prove nothing: Here You will find a *Resting-place*, and a *strong Retreat*, which They cannot shake.

Whatever is necessary to the preservation of a *Civil Government*, or to the hindrance of its *Destruction*, is included in the *Notion* of it.

But, to hinder effectually it's profess'd *Enemies* from *praying* to God, for it's *Destruction*; and instructing their *Hearers*, in what leads and obligeth

geth Them to ruine it ; this is absolutely necessary for its Preservation.

Therefore, *this* is included in the very *No- tion of Civil Government*.

That this was the *Case* in our Nation, is plain ; and that it may be the *Case* in *other Nations*, is as plain : And therefore, the Argument holds good against the *General Doctrine* of our *Adversaries*. To proceed,

Whatever is necessary to hinder the profess'd Enemies of a *Civil Government* from acting such a Part to its ruine, is within the reach of the *Civil Power*.

But the *Deprivation*, here spoken of, is nothing but another Word for it ; nothing but the very least of what was necessary to the hindrance of that Evil.

Therefore, That *Deprivation* is included in the *Right*, which is lodged in *Civil Government*, for it's own necessary Defense, and Preservation.

The Absurdity of the contrary Method, will appear, by supposing that the supreme *Civil Power* had permitted it's open Enemies, who set up *another Civil Power*, in opposition to it, to enjoy their *Bishopricks*, and the Rights of Them ; and *Them* and their *Clergy*, to be every Day, in their *Publick Congregations*, (as their *Consciences* would oblige them,) Praying and Preaching for another *King*, and against the *present*, with all their Zeal and Might. That *Civil Government* which had suffer'd this, had suffer'd it's own immediate Ruine ; and betray'd it's own Rights. Again,

Every degree of *Treason* is equally within the *Authority* of the *Supreme Civil Power*, effectually
to

to prevent. And consequently, to prevent the *Publick Avowal* of it's own Ruine, and Destruction: which is certainly, in the Nature of the thing, *Treason*. This must be granted, upon the Supposition of *Treason*; and therefore destroys the *General Principle* of the *Nonjurors*: as I shall shew presently.

But in applying it particularly, I confess, I do not apprehend what a *late Author*, on that Side, means, by saying, that the *Worst of their Enemies*, do not *charge* them with the same *Treason*, or the same sort of *Treason*, which He owns *Abiathar* to have been guilty of, against *Solomon*: which plainly consisted only in his having been in the *Interest* of a *Competitor* for the *Crown*. *Case of Schism*, p. 19. If He means by the *Worst of their Enemies*, Those who barely submit to the present *Government*, without thinking it to have any *Right* on its Side; I believe it may be true, that They are cautious of charging that Crime upon a *Party* of Men, whom They hardly think so much as mistaken. But as I rather think, He would call *Those* the *Worst of their Enemies*, who differ most from Them; and who truly think the *present Establishment* vested with All the Right that God and Man can give: I must assure Him, that We are obliged, by our *Principles*, to think Their *Prayers* and *Preaching*, to be *Treason*; as they imply in them, according to Dr *Hicks* himself, not only an *Opposition* to our *Government*, but a Solemn *Cursing* of it; and That a *Civil Government*, in it's Care of it's own *Preservation*, can make no Difference between *That*, and *Other* *Treason*.

The *Civil Power* hath a Right to hinder, by
Force,

Force, All *Treason*, and *Sedition*. *Praying*, and *Preaching publickly* against the *State*; Teaching and pressing *Rebellion* against *this State*; Not allowing Any so much as to communicate, in the *public Offices* of *Religion*, who are not resolved *Enemies* to *this State*; Declaring God's Wrath against *All* who support it: What are *These*, but *Treason*, made *ten times hotter* by *Religion*? And what is *Treason*, if these are not *Branches* of it? Now, This is the *Avowed Result* of the *Nonjurors* Adhering to the *Popish Line*. To hinder this, was absolutely necessary for the safety of the *State*. The least thing, necessary for this hindrance, was *Deprivation*: Which is, in Truth, Nothing but the *hindring*, and *forbidding that*, without the hindring of which, This must have been the *Public*, and *Open Procedure* of it's *Enemies*; and the *hindring* it, without proceeding to the *Extremities* of *personal Imprisonment*, or *Banishment*. In this, the *Lay-power* takes nothing to it self, as a *Spiritual Officer* in the *Church*; but solely, as endowed with a *Power*, and *Right*, to preserve it self.

They must be very weak, who are blinded in this *Argument* by the Word *Deprivation*, which happens to be an *Ecclesiastical Term* of *Art*. The *Deprivation* We are now speaking of, is nothing but hindring *Treason* by *Force*. And that can belong to no *Power*, but the *Civil Power*. The only *Answer* here can be, that this can belong to none but a *Rightful Civil Power*. That I maintain the *present Establishment* to be. But here, this *Answer* is of no Importance, because it must be remember'd that We are now speaking of that *General Principle*, which denies
this

this *Right* equally to the most *Rightful*, and the most *Unrightful Civil Power*. To proceed,

Whatever *Power* hath a *Right* to do a *greater Thing*, which includes in it a *less*, hath a *Right* to do the *less*, included in it. The *Civil Power* hath a *Right* to do a *greater Thing*, which includes *Deprivation*. And therefore, hath a *Right* to do the *less*. A *Rightful Civil Power* hath a *Right*, for the Defence of the *Publick*, to *Imprison*, to *banish*, or to *Execute*, any *Ecclesiastical Officer*, as well as any of the *Laity*: and consequently, to hinder Him from the *Actual Exercise* of his *Office*, if that will sufficiently consult the Safety of the Whole.

This, tho' very evident, wants a little Explanation: because our *Adversaries* grant the One, and deny the Other. *Bishops*, say They, *may be imprison'd, banish'd, fined, put to Death*, for the same *Reasons of State*, for which the *Laity* may: but they may not be *deprived*. Now, all this is, in truth, nothing but playing with Words. For what is this *Deprivation*, to which the *Civil Power* pretends a *Right*, but, in truth, and in reality, as much a *Civil Punishment*, upon a *Civil Account*, as any of the Others? Remember that the *Supposition* here, is allow'd by Themselves, of a *Rightful Civil Power*. This *Rightful Civil Power*, therefore, makes a *Law*, that All *Ecclesiastical Persons*, refusing to give Security of their *Allegiance*, (which is known to arise only from the Obligation they think themselves under, of zealously adhering to a *contrary Power*, and opposing *this*,) shall not exercise
their

their Ecclesiastical Offices, to the Ruine of this Civil Power. To say, that the Civil Power may imprison, or may banish them, or the like; but may not do *this*; is to say, that the Civil Power may not chuse any Punishment, but the most *Extreme*: It is to say, *The Civil Power may imprison an Ecclesiastic totally, but not partially; may banish an Ecclesiastic out of the whole Kingdom, but not out of a part of it.* For what indeed, and in effect, is this particular *Deprivation* of an *Ecclesiastic*, but a *partial Imprisonment*, as it is an hindrance from the *Actual Exercise* of his *Function*, as usual? What is it, but a *partial Banishment* from his former Station in the *Publick Assemblies*? The calling this a *Deprivation*, a thousand times over, alters not the Case at all. All the World knows, that the sort of it, We are now speaking of, was no other than *this*; a *Law* of the *Supreme Civil Power*, acting upon a *Civil Bottom*, for the preservation of the *Whole*; claiming only the *Power* of that *Preservation*, and of *Defense* against *Ecclesiastical Persons*, as well as others; and chusing this Method, rather than the *Extremity* of other *Methods*: Well knowing, that a *Right* to the *Greater*, includes in it a *Right* to the *Less*. Nor will the calling it, (in the more beloved Language,) the *Dethronization* of *Spiritual Princes*, help the matter at all. The business of the *Supreme Civil Power* (supposed here to be *Rightful*;) is effectually to guard what is committed to its Care. If the Consequence of that, be, the *Dethroning* of *Spiritual Princes*, who threaten its ruine; this is no

more against that *Right*, than the *Dethroning* of *Coordinate Temporal Princes*, when That becomes necessary to the same End. But it is indeed, no more than the hindring of *Temporal Subjects*, (for such *Spiritual Princes* are allowed to be,) from ruining their *Civil Governours*. This is all that the *Civil Power* hath done. And whatever follows from that by *Consequence*, the *Civil Power* cannot help; nor is it at all concern'd about.

Let us now consider *Two Instances*, which may serve to help Us more easily to conceive this Matter, The *One* is that of *Solomon*; the *Other* that of *St. John Chrysostom*, frequently mentioned by our *Adversaries*.

1. *Solomon*, in defense of his own *Right*, and the *State* in which He was *King*, deprived *Abiathar*; thrust Him out by Force, from being *Priest* unto the Lord: which He was, before this. If this were not a *Deprivation* from a *Right* to Exercise an *Ecclesiastical Office*, there never was an Instance of a *Deprivation* in the World. If you will believe our *Adversaries* themselves, He might justly have imprison'd Him; or banish'd Him out of the *Country*; or even executed Him. But he chose this, as a *lesser Punishment*, and gives His Reason for not going to greater *Extremity* with Him. 1. *Kings* 2. 26. *Solomon*, therefore, thought He had a *Right* to this, included in his *Right* to the other; as a *lesser*, in a *greater*. From hence the Argument is plain. If a *Rightful Civil Power* hath a *Right* to imprison, or to execute, for the Safety of the *Public*; much more, hath it a *Right* to what is less: that is, the thrusting out, or hindring by Force, a-
ny

ny Ecclesiastical Officer from the *Actual Exercise* of his Office. I shall consider, and explain, this Proceeding of *Solomon*, more fully, in the following Pages. I mention it now, as it justifies me in the present Argument, that a *Right* to execute, or *imprison*, or *banish*, implies in it a *Right* to remove an Ecclesiastic from a Place of too great Power and Trust, to be left in the Hands of a Traitor: which one of the *Nonjurors* allows to have been the Case of *Abiathar*; and overthrows his whole Design by it.

2. The Instance of *St. John Chrysostom*, They often in vain mention; and in contradiction to Themselves, and their own Principles. He was *banished*: And *banished*, for speaking against the *Empress*. And they argue, in general, for the Advantage of their own Cause; because his *Successor* was an *Usurper*, not to be adhered to. But granting this, what is this to their Cause? Let us suppose *Him* to have been a profess'd Enemy to the *State*, meeting with his People constantly to pray, and preach, with the utmost Zeal, against the Rightful *Emperour*; and, in consequence of his Notions, setting up *Another*, and denying Communion to All who would not join with Him against the *Emperour*. Let them put this Case; and They answer Themselves, that the *Emperour* had a *Right*, nay, might be obliged in Duty, to *Banish* Him, in defense of the Publick: In which, his *Deprivation* would have been so necessarily implied, that his *See* must have been Vacant; and *Another* might have been *rightfully* put into it, according to their own Notions; if

done according to the *Local Constitutions* of that Church, Had he been *banish'd* for *Treason*, by a *Rightful Civil Power*; then his *Case* had been something to this Cause; but entirely against their main Principle, even by their own confession. But as it is, it is nothing at all to the purpose; unless it be to prove that, by their way of arguing from it, the *Civil Power* can no more *banish*, than *deprive*, contrary to their own Allowance. To proceed,

Whatever belonged to *Civil Government*, still belongs to it by the *Will of God*; and is not touch'd by any *Rule of Practice*, or *Order of Ministers*, instituted by *Christ*: Only, the General Obligation of Obedience declared to lie upon *Every Soul*; and this *Declaration* made for the Sake of *Weak Christians*, who misunderstood, and misrepresented, the *Liberty* of the *Gospel*. Now again, a particular Set of *Christians*; and, (what is the great Wonder) a Set of *Christians*, who, upon Other Occasions, magnify the Office of the *Civil Magistrate* to an *Absolute Uncontrollable* Heighth, against their *Adversaries*; taking away with one hand, what they so liberally bestow with the Other; plead an *Exemption* for Themselves: and plainly prove that They mean their Doctrines of *Submission*, for Others, and not for Themselves. For it is, in Truth, in Effect, and in Consequence, an Exemption from *Civil Government*, if They can, under the pretense of *Spiritual Privileges*, and *Ecclesiastical Offices*, bring the World to think that the *Civil Government* hath no *Right* to hinder Them, (tho' it may hinder

hinder the *Laiety* from destroying it. For it is indeed, to say *that*, in other Words.

We are often told that *Kings, Princes, and States*, by becoming *Christian*, get nothing, but the Great Privilege of being *Subjects*, not only to *Christ*, and his Gospel; (which, I must say, are Words seldom mention'd by our *Adversaries*, with any such Concern as some *others* are;) but to *Ecclesiastical Princes*: Whom, by calling His *Vice-gerents*, They think to vest with All that Authority which He himself claim'd; nay, I will venture to say, in some Instances, with more Mere Authority than He himself ever claim'd. I will not here dispute this Point with Them; nor enter into that Heap of Absurdities, and (in my Judgment,) Blasphemies, which are implied in this Enormous Claim. I will only plead, in favour of *Kings, Princes, and States*, that they may lose nothing by being *Christians*: And shall think it enough, in the present Argument, to argue, from their own bountiful Concession, that *Ecclesiastical Princes*, or *Bishops*, have no Right to depose *Princes*, or ruine *States*.

And my first Argument here, is this. Whatsoever a *Heathen* had a Right to do, in his own defense, That, the same *King*, becoming *Christian*, hath a Right to do. But supposing, for instance, One of the first *Christian Bishops*, behaving himself so, in all his *Spiritual Offices*, as to make and confirm the Temporal Subjects of the *Emperour*, his settled sworn Enemies, upon Principle; and in an Interest directly opposite to His; This *Emperour* would have a Right to defend Him-

Himself; and, by virtue of this, as our *Adversaries* own, to banish, or imprison for ever, or even execute, this *Bishop*; in which is implied, as I have just now shew'd, his *Deprivation*, and the *Vacancy* of his *See*. The same *Emperor* therefore, losing no *Civil Right*, by becoming *Christian*, hath a *Right* to the same *Self-defense*: of which the other is only the *Unavoidable Consequence*.

Again, Whatever, *Solomon*, or any other *Jewish King*, had a *Right* to; the same remains to that *Prince*, supposing him to become *Christian*. But *Solomon* had a *Right*, as he plainly saith of Himself, to have put *Abiathar* to death, as a *State-Enemy*; and, included in that, a *Right* to thrust Him from his *Ecclesiastical Office*, by Force. The same *Right* therefore remains to *Solomon*, supposed a *Christian*, which was in Him, as a *Civil Governour*, whilst a *Jew*. The same is to be said of all *Supreme Civil Powers*.

From the *Concession* of our *Adversaries*, that *Bishops* have no *Right*, to depose, or ruine, *Kings*, or *States*, (supposed here to be *Rightful*.) the Argument necessarily stands thus. If *Ecclesiastical Princes* have no *Right* to ruine the *Supreme Civil Power*; then the *Supreme Civil Power* hath a *Right* to defend it self against them, by Force, whenever that *Ruin*, or that *Deposition*, (for they are only different Words for the same thing,) is threaten'd, and profess'd: And consequently, a *Right* to every thing necessary for that *Self-defense*. The *Civil Power* therefore, may rightfully hinder by Force, their *Actual Exercise* of their
Office

Office in publick; whenever it is exercised so, as to teach, and inculcate upon their Followers, as well as to pray to God earnestly for, the Ruine of that *Civil Power*, and the Prosperity of it's Enemies. This *hindring by Force*, is the *Deprivation* now spoken of: and is the Consequence of that *Concession*. Because it is evident that, supposing a *Civil Power* not to have this *Right*, it follows, that *Bishops* have a *Right*, not to be controll'd, to *ruine States and Kingdoms*, by their Conduct in their Offices; that is, to *depose Kings*, in reality: Which is contrary to the thing granted. Turn it over a thousand times, I am certain you will find the *one* or the *other* true; unless You suffer your selves to be misled by the sound of Words. Either *Kings and States*, have a *Right* to *depose Bishops*, in Cases now mentioned; or, *Bishops* have a *Right* to *depose Kings*, and overturn *States*. But this is denied, at present at least, by our *Nonjurors* themselves, Therefore, the former must be true.

To proceed, As God approves of every thing necessary to *Civil Government*, it is necessarily implied in that, that He approves of no *Powers*, or *Privileges*, in any Persons upon Earth, which are in such Sense *Independent* upon it, as to be *Inconsistent* with it. And therefore, when any of our *Adversaries* assault you with *High Encomiums* of *Ecclesiastical Offices*; and extol to the Skies, the *Powers* and *Privileges* of *Clergy-men*; debasing every Thing below them: Assure them, That You are ready to pay all due Respect to them, in the Execution of the *Good Work*, and *Holy Office*, They have

have undertaken : But remember at the same time,

Whatever *Powers* and *Privileges*, (be they of never so high a Nature,) belong to *Clergy-men*, must come from *God*, and *Christ*. But *God*, and *Christ*, cannot give Them any *Powers*, or *Privileges*, in such sense *Independent* upon *Civil Government*, as to be *Inconsistent* with it : because They cannot encourage any thing *Inconsistent* with what They approve of, in every Country of the World equally.

Therefore, No such *Powers*, or *Privileges*, can belong to any Body of Men, as imply in them that the *Supreme Civil Power* hath not a Right to every thing necessary to prevent it's own destruction.

There can, consequently, nothing be implied in the *Powers* or *Privileges* of *Clergy-men*, to hinder the *Supreme Civil Power* from *depriving* Them ; if that *Deprivation* be necessary and sufficient for the Defense, and Safety of the Whole : A Right in any *Civil Power*, being an Insignificant Absurdity, without including in it a Right to defend that Right from all it's Enemies. And again,

If the *Gospel* hath established an *Independency* of it's *Ministers* upon the *Civil Power*, in such sense, as that the *Civil Power* hath not a Right effectually to hinder their *Preaching*, and *Praying*, and forming Societies, for it's destruction ; then, the *Gospel* hath left *Civil Government*, under *subjection*, and entirely at the mercy of it's *Ministers*. But it is certain, that it is so far from *That*, that the *Gospel* hath left *Civil Government* as it found it ;
and

and hath, on the contrary, put it's *Ministers*, and *Preachers*, as far as the Ends of *Civil Government* reach, equally under it's *Authority*, with all Others. *Ecclesiastical Officers*, are no more excepted, than Any Others. If they were, there would be an End of the *Civil Power*, whenever They pleased to set Themselves and their Congregations, both in their *Publick Prayers*, and *Doctrines*, against it. As certainly therefore, as the *Gospel* is a *Friend* to *Civil Government*; so certainly, the *Ministers* of it can have no *Powers* or *Privileges*, which can imply any *Exemption*, in *Cases* which directly affect the *Civil Power*; or, which is all one, can imply in them, that the *Civil Power* shall not defend and preserve it self from being destroyed by Them.

If it be objected, that the *Civil Power*, according to this way of arguing, may proceed to hinder all *Ministers* from preaching the *Gospel*; and the like; under the same Pretense: The Answer is plain, that it is no Argument against a *Right* in any Person, or Society, because They may *mistake*, and think it implies in it more than it doth. They who make this *Objection*, being in this inconsistent with Themselves, as in many other things, allow to the *Civil Power*, the *Authority* of *banishing*, *imprisoning*, &c. But still, with respect to the Power of *Depriving Bishops*, We find it ask'd, (by the Person who wrote with Dr Hicks's Directions, and under his Eye,) *Collect. of Papers*, p. 305. *Doth not this Doctrine allow a Nero, or a Julian, utterly to destroy the Church, and thereby to frustrate our Saviour's Promise, that*

it should continue to the End of the World? I answer, *No more than Solomon's Right to deprive Abiathar, allowed the Jewish Kings to destroy the whole Priesthood, and the whole Mosaical Religion.* If this was no Argument against *Solomon's Right*; no more can it be an Argument against the same Right in *Others*. I answer again, *Not so much,* as the Power of *banishing, and imprisoning, and executing*: which is allowed of, in general. But I hope, *The Nonjurors* allowing this, doth not imply in it, the *Allowing* a *Nero*, or a *Julian*, to persecute, to banish, to execute, unrighteously, or unjustly. If it doth; I am sure, that is a quicker Way to the destruction of the *Church*, than the *other*. And if it doth not; then there is an *End* of this false Argument. One would indeed, *blush* for Men, who talk of *Argument*, to read such a *Question* as this: And for Men, who profess so great a Concern for Christ's Promise to his Church, above their Neighbours, to find them in as mean an Opinion: of *His Power, or Veracity*, as the greatest Deist himself could be; and imagining that any thing that a *Nero*, or a *Julian*, can do, can hinder *Christ* himself from *fulfilling his Promise*.

But there is another thing, which They would do well to consider; that this same *Objection* would be hard against *Ecclesiastical Power* itself; which They, who make it, would willingly preserve untouch'd. It hath proved true in *Fact*, that the *Ecclesiastical Power*, under pretense of having *Authority* in matters of *Religion*, hath absolutely, in many Countries, *extinguish'd*

guish'd the very Light of the *Gospel*, and put in it's place, nothing but what is calculated to support it's own Exorbitant Pretensions. Will these Persons allow that this is a Good Argument against all *Ecclesiastical Authority*; because it hath been *abused* against the Good of *Christ's Church*? When *Others* therefore, contend that the *Civil Power* must have a *Right* to every thing truly necessary, for it's own Safety: Ought it not to be as much allowed by *Themselves*, that Mistakes, and Wickedness, are not at all justified by This; but indeed, condemn'd, by Implication and Consequence?

That which seems to me to have cast a Cloud over so many Understandings, in this *Controversy*, is, the Imagination that this is to intermix the *Civil Power*, in matters not of a *Civil Nature*; and to make it interfere with *Other Powers*, of a quite different sort. It will therefore, not be improper to shew You, how the *Case* stands between Them; and that the very *contrary* to this, is true: Still remembring the Supposition, allowed in this *Debate*, of a *Rightful Civil Power*,

Whatever affects the *Civil Power*; let it be, in it's first *origin*, never so much of an *Ecclesiastical* or *Religious Nature*; tho' esteem'd an *Article*, or *Duty*, of Religion by *Those* who embrace it; This makes no difference: If it directly and plainly affects the *Civil Power*, it becomes a matter of a *Civil Nature*, and, in the Eye of the *Civil Power*, can be looked upon as no other. It is of no importance, upon what it is originally founded; or

of what Nature it is, in it's first Principle ; or, whether it be embraced, by any Set of Men, as part of the *Gospel* it self, or not. Whatever it be ; if it directly affects the *Civil Power*, it becomes, I say, a matter of a *Civil Nature* : and is made, of necessity, the Object of the *Magistrate's* Care and Concern.

For Instance, It was a matter of a *Religious Nature*, to *Those* who embraced that wild *Notion*, that the *Temporal Kingdom* of *Jesus Christ* was to be set up by *their Force*. But to the *Civil Power*, threaten'd and attack'd by this, it was as much a matter of a *Civil Nature*, as the setting up *One* of themselves in open Rebellion, would have been. Thus, in the present Case, *Publick Praying*, and *Preaching*, is a matter of a *Spiritual*, and *Ecclesiastical* Nature. But *Publick Praying*, and *Preaching*, against a *Civil Government*, is, to that Government, entirely of a *Civil Nature* : and can be consider'd no otherwise by any one. It becomes *Civil Rebellion* : and is properly the Concern of the *Civil Power*. It may be an *Article* of some Men's *Religion* : And their *Consciences* may be so framed, as to direct them to it ; as it was, in the Case of the *Fifth-Monarchy-men*. In this respect, They must be left to *God*, the Great Judge of the World. But, as to the present State of things, this doth not change the Case. It becomes truly of a *Civil Nature* ; and is not at all alter'd by being called *Praying*, and *Preaching*, by virtue of any *Spiritual* or *Ecclesiastical Authority*. To interpose in it, is to interpose in it, as it is

a matter of a *Civil Nature*, threatning Ruine to the *Civil Power*. And whatever is *necessary* to the hindring that *Evil*, is likewise so far, of a *Civil Nature*, and the *Duty* and *Right* of the *Civil Power*.

Again, The Exercise of the *Episcopal Office* is a matter, *primarily*, of an *Ecclesiastical Nature*. But the Exercise of the *Episcopal Office*, to the destruction of a *Rightful Civil Power*, (which is here supposed,) is of a *Civil Nature*: And the doing whatever is necessary, to the preventing that Ruine, can be consider'd only as a Matter of a *Civil Nature*. Now if it be necessary to that End, to hinder any One from the Exercise of *that Office*; this becomes a matter of a *Civil Nature*, because the *Civil Power* is undone without it. And consequently, It is not interposing in purely *Spiritual Matters*, but in *Temporal*, to exert that *Right*, which is in all *Governments* for their *Preservation*.

How often hath it been said by our *Greatest Divines*, that, had the *Christian Religion* contain'd any thing in it, tending to the Ruine of the *Heathen Civil Powers* then in being; or, Had the *first Christians* spent their Time, in their publick Assemblies, in *Praying* and *Preaching*, against their *Persons*, *Rights*, or *Interest*; They could not have been blamed for persecuting and extirpating them? This would not have been any thing more, than interposing in a *Matter* purely of a *Civil Nature*: as *Every thing* becomes,
let

let it take it's first Rise whence it will, as soon as it directly opposes, or threatens, the *Civil Power*. This would not have proceeded from any *Right* to mix the *Civil Power* with matters purely *Spiritual*: but from the *Right*, inherent in all *Governments* equally, of *Self-defense*, and *Self-preservation*. This alone is sufficient for the present purpose: For there is no one, who denies the same *Right* to the *Civil Power*, in the Hands of a *Christian*, which is granted to it, in the Hands of a *Heathen*; because this is attributed to it, only consider'd as *Civil*.

The *Great Cloud*, therefore, I say, which hides the *Light* from some Men, is, the *Mistake*, as if what is here given to the *Christian Civil Power*, ariseth solely from an *Imaginary Right* in that *Supreme Civil Power*, to mix it self in Matters purely *Spiritual*. I have therefore, here stated the *Case*, in another manner: and shewn that this particular *Deprivation* by the *Supreme Civil Power*, is a *Point* of a *Civil Nature*; and ariseth, not from any *Mixing* of *Two Incoherent Powers*, but from the *One Undoubted and Undeniable Principle*, of *Self-defense*; and from this plain *Maxim*, that the *Civil Power* could not be the *Civil Power*, without having a *Right* (properly so called,) to do every thing, necessary for it's own *Preservation* from *Ruine*, and for the *Support* of it's *Civil Authority*.

The *contrary Supposition* will confirm what I say. For, supposing the *Civil Power* not to have

have this Right ; then it must be true, that the *Ministers* of the *Gospel*, (which Expression I chuse to make use of, because of it's Extent,) have a *Right* to be exempt from the *Civil Power*, in *Cases* which affect the *Civil Power* in the tenderest Parts; and which are therefore, of a *Civil Nature*; or, in other Words, have a *Right* to ruine the *Civil Power*, (for *that* must be the Consequence;) and to set up themselves in it's very Place, and to make Themselves truly, and effectually, the *Civil Power*. Now this is a manifest Absurdity; a plain confounding of *Two Rights*, as distinct as *Heaven* and *Earth*: And only tends to make *All Civil Power*, follow the *Ecclesiastical*. This is, at first, *Imperium in Imperio*; a *Kingdom* within a *Kingdom*: which is, properly speaking, the setting up of *One Authority*, opposite and contradictory to *Another*, in the same *Individual Causes*; the setting up a *Spiritual Power*, in opposition to the *Civil*, in those very Points, in which the *Civil Estate* of the *Kingdom*, is extremely concern'd, and plainly threatned.

This *Contest* between these *Two Powers*, is an *Absurdity*, and a *Great Evil*, whilst it lasts. But it doth not last long. The *Civil Power*, properly so called, must quickly be swallowed up into the *Other*. It is natural to expect it, and true in *Experience*. At *Rome*, All is come, by degrees, to be lodg'd in the Hands of *One*. And in all other Countries, the
more

more blindly, and strongly, the *Pope's* Authority hath been receiv'd; and the more Extensive the *Exemption* of *Ecclesiasticks* hath been; the *Civil Power*, though lodged in distinct Hands, yet hath the more effectually been render'd insignificant; not to be possess'd, not to be maintain'd, without a *License* from the *Other*: Till All other Subjects, as well as *Ecclesiastical*, have been absolved from their *Allegiance*, upon several Occasions; and the *Civil Power*, (tho' never so *Rightful* in it's *Title*, or Good in it's Administration,) torn to pieces, at their pleasure. For if once this *Exemption* be granted; and it be so, that the *Ecclesiastical* is not under the *Civil Power*, in Cases of the aforesaid Nature: the *Civil Power* must be under the *Ecclesiastical*; and live and subsist upon its Good Pleasure, till the time comes of swallowing it up. Nor can there be any Difference in this *Part of Popery*, whether the *Pope* live at *Rome*; or in *England*. The Summ of the matter is this.

The Supreme *Civil Authority* must of *Right* be endowed with every *Power* necessary to it's *Defense*, as a *Civil Power*. Otherwise, it is not the *Civil Power*.

But the *Power* of doing whatever is necessary for preserving it self from being ruined by *Ecclesiastical Persons*, as well as *Others*, is necessarily implied in this.

And consequently, must of *Right* belong to it.
And

And *this*, without the least interfering with *Powers* of another nature, or with any thing *essential* to them. For it is not at all necessary to the *Church of Christ*, that such or such a particular Person should have a *Right* always to exercise the same Office. If it were, no *one* could ever be *deprived* at all, by the *Authority* of the *Clergy*, any more than by *that* of the *Laity*. But it is absolutely necessary to the *Being* of the *Civil Power*, that any *Ecclesiastical Person* should be deprived of his *Right* to the Exercise of his *Office*, if that *Exercise* of his *Office* be inconsistent with the *Safety* of the *State*: which was the *Case* of *Abiathar*, in *Solomon's* *Reign*. Now this is *all* that is included in the *Deprivation* we are now speaking of: *viz.* the *Right* of hindring an *Ecclesiastical Person* from exercising his *Function*, which He cannot exercise without the manifest *Hazard* of the *State*. And, if instead of *Deprivation*, (which happens to be an *Ecclesiastical Term* of *Art.*) the same thing were express'd in those other Words; it could not possibly be denied to belong to the *Care* and *Office* of the *Rightful Civil Power*, and *that* only; and that the *Ecclesiastical Authority* interposing in it, would be to mix it self in a *Matter* purely *Civil*, and of a *Secular Concernment*.

And therefore, tho' it may be said, that *Deprivations* upon *other* Accounts must be performed by a *Spiritual Authority*; yet certainly, it cannot be proved, by any *Ecclesiastical Principles*, that *this* sort of *Deprivation* must be so. Because a *Matter* of a *Civil Nature* must belong to the *Civil Power*. Now, whatever, *Deprivations* upon several other

Accounts may be; yet, without doubt, a *Deprivation*, upon an Account merely *Civil*, is a Matter of a *Civil Nature*. And therefore, not only belongs to the *Civil Power*; but cannot indeed belong to any other: nor depend upon the Consent, Ratification, or Confirmation, of any other. For if it did, it would be entirely at the Disposal of *that other*, whether the *Civil Power* should be supported or ruined: which is a Supposition absurd in it self, and destructive of all Human Society; and therefore cannot be true.

Our *Adversaries* often seem willing to interest the *Scripture* in this Part of the *Controversy*. But it happens that, in the *New Testament*, the *Gospel* is so represented, that the *Independency* of its *Ministers* is no more to be found *there*, than the *Independency* of its *Laity* upon the *Civil Power*. Every *Soul* is equally left *subject*, in Matters of Concern to the Ends of *Civil Government*. And *Independency* in *these*, is as far from the *Sound*, as from the *Meaning*, of the *Gospel*.

And, in the *Old Testament*, from which they often bring their *Parallels*, there is so plain, and so unexceptionable an *Instance* against themselves, in this very *Point* of *Deprivation*, that, I think, their own *Answers* shew the *Impossibility* of getting clear of it. *I. Kings* 2. 27. *Solomon*, upon an Account merely *Civil*, relating to his own *Right* to the *Crown*, thrust out *Abiathar* from being *Priest unto the Lord*: And the same *Solomon* put *Zadock* the *Priest* in his room, v. 35. That is, *Solomon* deprived One of the Exercise of his *Function*, to which he had been appointed, according to the
Insti-

Institution of God himself: and the same *Solomon* appointed another to succeed him. What can be a more express *Parallel* than this, of the *Supreme Civil Power*, depriving one *Ecclesiastical Person*, and putting in *Another*, upon the sole Consideration of the *Interest* of the *State*? But this is evaded.

1. *Abiathar*, it is said, had not so much *Right* to that *Post*, as *Zadock*; and so *Solomon* did nothing but put out *One*, and put in *Another* who had more *Right*. Now, this admits of a Reply, equally disagreeable and contradictory to our *Adversaries* Principles, whether *Abiathar* was *Rightful High-Priest*; or not. For, if He had the *Right*; then *Solomon* displaced a *rightful High-Priest*. If he had not; then it is as plain, that the *Peoples* Acceptance with God, and being blessed by God, did not so much depend upon the *regular Succession*, and *Right*, of Persons exercising the *Priestly Office*, as our *Adversaries* constantly contend, in this same Controversy. Besides, if this were so; this is an Instance of a *King*, depriving an *High Priest*, upon an Account merely *Ecclesiastical*, viz. because he was not the *rightful High Priest*; which is a stronger *Argument* against Themselves, than we can raise from hence. For, indeed, wherever the *Right* lay; it plainly appears, that *Solomon* thrust *Him out*, not because *He* had no *Right* to the *Priesthood*, but merely because he had shewn himself an *Enemy* to his Title to the *Crown*: which makes this Instance of equal Importance to the present Argument, whether *He*, or *Zadock*, had the better *Right*. The *One* was displaced, merely as an *Enemy*; the *Other* put in, merely as a *Friend*. Now

the *Question* in hand is, not, what the *Case* was between *Abiathar*, and *Zadock*; but, what *Ground* *Solomon* went upon; or, what *Power* and *Authority* He assumed, as a *King*. And that was plainly this, to remove *one High Priest*, for being in a contrary Interest; and to place *Another* in his room, whom *He* could depend upon.

2. That *Abiathar* had been guilty of *Treason*, One of their late *Advocates* allows to be a good Ground for what he suffer'd. Now, what was this *Treason*, but setting up *Another Prince*, in Opposition to *Solomon*? The same *Case* exactly (in our present *Argument*, in which our Government is supposed to be *rightful*) with the *deprived Bishops*. If therefore, the *Deprivation* was lawful in *one Case*; certainly, in the *other*.

3. Another Evasion is, That the *Church* perhaps had *deprived* him before; tho' it be not so said. Now, if this had been so; and of so great Importance as we are often made to believe; the *Writer* of this *History* would not have omitted it, as a little *trivial Circumstance*. But how great (I had almost said, how *wicked*) must that *Prejudice* be, which, when the *History* saith expressly, *Solomon thrust him out from being Priest unto the Lord*; and again, *that the King put Zadock in his room*; nay, and relates the very Reasons, *Solomon* himself gave, why He would not *take away his Life*, as He might have done, but only *thrust him out from being Priest*: Which, after all this, I say, rather than desert a *Cause* which can't be defended, can *invent a new Account*; and interpose in this Matter, with *it may be*, and *perhaps*, *Solomon* did not *thrust him*

out of that Office; but the Church thrust him out from being Priest; and that Solomon, in what He did, only follow'd Orders, and was the Churches Executioner? It may as well be said, that He neither order'd the killing of Adonijah, nor of Joab; nor indeed had any Right over the Life of Abiathar, (which He plainly claims) without the Authority of the Church: for one is full as plain and express, in the same Chapter, as the others: and all spoken of, as equally flowing from his own Civil Authority.

4. Another Evasion is, That Abiathar had both the Title and Revenue of High Priest after this. But it is very plain that, what Revenue soever he had, was Matter of Favour and Mercy, not of Right; and only a Permission from Solomon. His being called Priest afterwards, can't possibly prove that He was not thrust out from being High Priest, as the Text expressly saith. For He could not possibly be thrust out from being High Priest, and yet not be thrust out, at the same time. He could not be out of his Office, and in his Office, at the same Instant. Nor is it of any Importance in this Question, whether Abiathar was afterwards only call'd Priest, as one that had been Priest; or whether He really were so, or not. For if he was really so, He was restored to his Office by the same Civil Power; by Solomon alone: (tho' I can't see how this Supposition is consistent with the fulfilling the Word of the Lord, as it is said in this same place, referring to I Sam. 2. 35.) And this, I think, will be still more in favour of the Civil Power.

But

But these *Evasions* are all in vain : and so, it would be, if they could find never so much difference between the Circumstances of the *Jewish Priests*, and the *Christian Bishops*. The great thing, which they can never get rid of, is, that It is still, (let them say what they please, and turn it round till their Heads are giddy with it,) an *Instance* of a *King*, a *Secular Prince*, a *Subject*, in their Phrase, of the *Ecclesiastical Power*, in Religion, *depriving, removing, thrusting out*, by his own *Authority*, his *Ecclesiastical Superior*; *thrusting out* by Force, the *Priest of the Lord*, from being *Priest of the Lord*; *taking away* what He never gave; nay, what *Abiathar* had from God Himself. Let them put it in as high, and as terrible Words, as they please; still it is very plain that *Solomon* ventur'd at it, in his own Defense; and this, without Censure, from God or Man. The Point is too evident to be denied, that *Abiathar* was in an *Ecclesiastical Office*; that He was *thrust out*, or *deprived*, by *Solomon*, v. 27. (and not by the Church;) that the *King*, (not the Church,) put *Zadock* in his room, v. 35. and that *Abiathar* was never again in that Office, from which He was once *thrust out*, because the Place was filled with *Zadock*; who is named before *Abiathar*, when He is call'd *Priest*, ch. 4. v. 4.

In the present Question therefore, the Argument from *Solomon's Example*, can be no other than this. *Solomon thrust out, or deprived, Abiathar, from being Priest, who was before Priest of the Lord*; and the same *Solomon put Zadock in his room*: and this, upon an Account merely *Secular* and *Political*. There-

Therefore, if *His Example* be of any Importance, it is the *Right* of the *Supreme Civil Power* to *deprive Ecclesiastical Persons*, and place *Others* in their room, when *Self-Preservation* really and plainly makes it necessary. Consequently, this *Instance of Solomon* is a plain *Instance* against the general *Principle* of our *Adversaries*.

This *Instance of Solomon* is likewise, as I have shewn before, a plain *Instance* of a *King's* having not only the *Power* of *Imprisoning*, *Banishing*, *Executing*, &c. but of *Depriving*: and a *Proof* that, if *Deprivation* secures the *State*, the *State* may chuse that *Punishment* which is less, before another which is greater, and to which it hath a *Right*.

One Thing I must repeat, before I leave this *Instance*. Either this *thrusting out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord*, (or, in *Dr. Hickes's* Language, from his *Throne*,) was a Matter of a *Civil Nature*; or of a *Spiritual Nature*. Let them chuse which they please. If it were of a *Civil Nature*; then, as such, it was perform'd by the *Civil Power*. If of a *Spiritual*; it will be of worse Consequence to the Cause of our *Adversaries*, because it will give to the *Supreme Civil Power* all the *Right*, which *Solomon's* Example can give, to interpose in *Spiritual Affairs*. Nor need the Fate of *Corah* (so often mention'd by our *Adversaries*) terrify them; because *Solomon* ought much more to have been terrified by *that*, if it had related to this Case: Whereas, it is plain, *He* thought it of no Concern to him, acting for his own necessary *Self-Defense*.

I have

I have thus traced the Reasonings, and Insinuations, of our *Adversaries*, back to their Original and First Spring. And, I hope, I have fully satisfied You, in the *particular Controversy* between *Them*, and the *Protestant Succession*, now fixed amongst us, in *Exclusion* of the *Popish Line*, that the Nature and Ends of Government, the Will of God, and the very Being of our Laws and Constitution, absolutely *required* this *Exclusion*, and this *Settlement*; and therefore certainly *justify* the *Right* and *Title* of that *Illustrious Family* now upon the *Throne*, to the Consciences and Approbation of All who will *think*, without *Prejudice*, upon this Subject: And likewise, in their *General Controversy* with *all Civil Power*, to which they absolutely deny the *Right* of deposing *Bishops*, and other *Ecclesiastical Persons*, that I have proved *this Right* to belong to it, from the very Nature and Essence of *Civil Government*; as something so necessary to it's Preservation, that it may (at any time) be ruined and dissolved without it; which is the *highest* sort of Proof; and confirm'd, as I have shewn, by the *Gospel*; as well as by a plain *Instance* under the *Law*.

Supposing therefore, (what I never can grant for the Sake of the *Honour* of God, and of the *Christian Religion*,) that their Grand *Spiritual Topics* had any Reason in them; that the Benefit of God's own Appointments to *You*, depends upon a *Regular, uninterrupted Succession* of *Rightful Bishops*; (which God's Providence never yet, in Fact, kept up, as far as we can judge of things;) or that your *Communion* with any *Bishops*, succeeding

ing *such* as have been deposed by an unlawful and undue Authority, destroys all your Title to God's Favour (which *He* himself hath never told you:) I say, supposing these and the like Points, with which they amaze, rather than convince, their weak Followers; yet, here you have a Resting-Place, and you see how the Cause lies before you, as to the Concerns of our own Nation, to which They apply the whole.

The Exclusion of the *Popish Line*, from all *Civil Power* over this Nation, was necessary, just, and lawful. That *Civil Power*, from which They were excluded, was justly lodged in the Hands of the next *Protestant Heir*. The *Supreme Civil Power*, having then the true and proper Authority of Government, had a *Right* to every thing necessary to its own Defence and Preservation: And consequently, had a *Right* to depose those *Bishops*, who refused to give any Security of their *Allegiance*, and actually set up another *Civil Power* in Opposition to it. And the *Possessor* of the *Crown*, as certain a *Right* to name others to succeed Them in those *Bishopricks*, as any former *Kings* had before, to name Those very deposed *Bishops*.

There is no Terror therefore, from their *Alarms*, even upon their own Notions of *Regularity* and *Schism*: because, these *Bishops* having been rightfully deposed, their *Successors* are the *Regular Bishops*; the *Churches* of their *Successors* are the true *Churches*; the setting up *Altars* against their *Altars* is the true *Schism*; the Centre of *Unity* is with Them; and God's Favours and Graces, dispensed by Them alone. And much less Terror to

L

You,

jon, from the *Excommunication* denounced in one
 of the *Canons* of the *Church* against All who de-
 ny or impugn the *King's Supremacy* in *Ecclesia-
 stical Causes*; which some of them have the Va-
 nity and Blindness to allege in favour of *Them-
 selves*: arguing that the *King* there mentioned, is
 the *Rightful King*; that the *Rightful King* is the
King whom They own; that all who join in the
present Establishment deny *His Supremacy*, and con-
 sequently are *excommunicated* by the *Canon*; up-
 on which *Excommunication* these *Christian Divines*
 command all God's Wrath to attend. One would
 think, it were enough to repeat *this*, to fill all
 their own Followers, with a *Detestation* of such
 Principles, as make the *Gospel* thus vain, and
 romantick, and barbarous. But their *Weakness*, is
 here equal to their *Presumption*. For there are
Two Ways, to which they lie open to their own
Denunciations. The *First* is this. If the present
Establishment should happen to be *Rightful*, (as I
 have proved it to be, from the *strongest* of all *Civil
 Principles*,) then, these very *Men* themselves are
 the *Excommunicated Persons*, entitled to all the Evils
 of their own *Hypothesis*, supposing it to be *true*.
 The *other* Way concludes against them, more cer-
 tainly. For, all the World knows that their *great
 Advocates* have zealously and openly denied the *Sup-
 remacy* of all *Kings*; as well of *King James*; as
 of *King WILLIAM*, and *King GEORGE*. From
 whence it follows, that either they do not be-
 lieve themselves in the terrible things they tell us
 of *Excommunication*, and only use *them*, as they
 would *Stories of Hobgoblins* and *Bugbears*, to
 frighten

frighten the weakest of *Women* and *Children*; or else, that their *principal* and *mighty Advocates*, and all their Followers, have lived and died in that miserable Condition, in which they describe such Persons to be; that all their *sacred Offices* were invalid to their *People*, and *Nullities* in themselves; and that their own *Bishops*, and their own *Churches*, are *unchristian'd*, and *unchurched*, by themselves.

And again, when they tell you in some Places that *Polluting* or *Immoral Prayers*, and *Polluted Worship*, are sufficient Reasons for setting up, and continuing *Bishops* against the Claims of *other Bishops*; this inevitably leaves in your own Consciences the Judgment of such Prayers, and such Worship: And this alone, upon their own *Church-Principles*, layeth an Obligation upon *All*, who sincerely judge the *Popish Line* to have no *Right*, and the *Protestant Line* to be *Rightful*, to depart from the *Communion* of the *Non-juring Bishops*, and their *Worship*, in which they think God affronted by *immoral Prayers*; and to join in other Worship directly opposite to it. Nor can they possibly find out any Ground for condemning this procedure, but this *One*, which it is high time to be ashamed of, on all Sides, *That Men have a Right to judge about Doctrines and Worship, if they judge as We our selves do: But if they differ from our Judgment, they have no such Right at all.*

I do not love, I confess, so much as to repeat the *principal Branches* of their *Beloved Scheme*: They are so different, from whencesoever they come, from

the Voice of the Gospel. But the *Artillery* of our Adversaries, is certainly *thus* turn'd against *Themselves*. And, methinks, it should move them a little, to consider no more than this, that, unless they are *infallibly certain*, both of their *Principles*, and of their *Conduct*; it *may be* true that their *Bishops* were rightfully deposed; and that *then* they have themselves framed a *System*, to cast *Themselves* out of God's Favour, and to conclude *Themselves* under that State of *Damnation*, which they have invented for *Others*.

But this is not all that ought to be said to such a *System* of *Powers* and *Privileges*, as They have annexed to their *Spiritual Offices*: to create, one would think, the *Horror* of a *dreadful Veneration*, rather than the *Affection* of a *Reasonable Respect*. What I have just now remarked, may shew that there is so much to be said, upon the best and truest Foundations, for the *Right* of the *Supreme Civil Power* of this *Kingdom*, against the *Deposed Bishops*, that it is not out of any fear for our own Cause, that we need to deny their *Scheme* of *Church-Power* and *Sacerdotal Privileges*; because the *whole* may so easily be turned against *Themselves*. But this *Matter* is of that great Importance to all *Humane Society*; of that Scandal and Reproach to *Christianity* it self; of that Malignity in it's Influences upon the whole of true Religion; and of that Indignity to the *GOD* and Governour of the World; that it is, not only in our *Adversaries*, but in *All Parties*, and on all sides, universally and constantly to be opposed. This, therefore, will be *another* safe and easy Method of securing
your

your selves against their *Spiritual Terrors* and *Allurements*.

When *They* would allarm you, (as their *Fellow-Labourers* the *Papists* do,) by telling you that you cannot hope for the favour of God, but in the *strictest Communion* with *their Church*; (which is the *true Church of England*, governed by *Bishops* in a *Regular Succession*;) that God hath himself hung your Salvation upon this Nicety; that He dispenseth none of his *Favours*, or *Graces*, but by the Hands of *Themselves*, and their Subordinate *Priests*; that you cannot be *Authoritatively Blessed*, or *Releas'd* from your Sins, but by *Them*, who are the *Regular Priests*; that *Churches*, under *other Bishops*, are *Schismatical Conventicles*, made up of *Excommunicated* Persons, both *Clergy* and *Laity*; out of God's *Church*, as well as out of his Favour: I say, when such *Arguments* as these are urged, you need only to have recourse to a *General Answer* to this whole Heap of *Scandal and Defamation*, upon the Will of God; the Gospel of Christ; and the *Church of England*, in particular.

You may tell them securely, that you have not so understood the *Nature* of that *God*, who is your *Governour*, and *Judge*; that you have not so learn't *Christ*; or the *Design* of his *Gospel*; or, even, the foundation of this particular part of his *Church*, reform'd and establish'd in *England*. The following *Arguments* will justify you: Which therefore ought to be frequently in the thoughts of *All*, who have any value left for the most *Important Points*.

God

God is just, and equal, and Good: and, as sure as He is so, He cannot put the Salvation, and Happiness, of *any Man*, upon what He himself hath put it out of the Power of *any Man* upon Earth, to be entirely satisfied in. It is certainly *Absurdity*, and, I fear, *Blasphemy*, to Suppose that God hath given away the disposal, either of his *Mercy*, or of his *Wrath*, out of his own Hands, into those of weak, vain, and passionate *Men*, as capable of all Errors, and of all Wickedness, as any of their Brethren. And, if He hath *not*; then you may, with security, as you ought in duty, depend upon *Him* alone, and wait for His *final Determination*.

It hath not pleased God, in his *Providence*, to keep up any Proof of the *least Probability*, or *moral Possibility*, of a *Regular Uninterrupted Succession*. But there is a great Appearance, and humanely speaking, a *Certainty* of the contrary; that this *Succession* hath been often *interrupted*: especially in the opinion of *Those* who maintain all *Lay-Baptisms*, and all Offices performed by Persons, who either have been irregularly ordained, or have *forged* their *Pretensions* to *Ordination*, to be *mere Nullities*: There having been certainly a great Number of such like Instances.

It is highly absurd, to put so important a point, as God's favour, and Eternal Happiness, upon what no Man living can ever be acquainted with, to his Satisfaction. But still more absurd, to put it upon a *matter*, the contrary to which appears to be true. This is the Case here. This *Regular Uninterrupted Succession*

tion of Persons qualified and regularly ordained, is a *matter* impossible to be proved. Nay, the *contrary* is more than probable, upon all *Historical Evidence*: Which we receive in other Cases. Therefore, your Interest in the favour of God can have nothing to do with it. As sure as *God* is just, He would have laid this *Matter* open and plain to the Capacities of those whose Salvation was to depend upon it. Now, He hath in fact been so far from making this plain, in his Providence; that He hath rather made the contrary plain. Therefore, *This* cannot be the *Point*, upon which your *Salvation* can at all depend.

Amongst our selves particularly, the *Case* will admit of another *Argument*, drawn from the peculiar Circumstances of our *Church*, and the inextricable Difficulties arising from them: which I would not so willingly speak of, were it not, that the *Church* of *Rome* is making continual use of this sort of *Argument*, in which some *Protestants* take so much delight. It is very well known that, ever since the *Reformation*, there hath been a Regular *Succession* of *Bishops* kept up, certainly in *Ireland*; and probably in *England* also; by the *Church* of *Rome*. At least we may have leave to suppose it; and that is the same thing, as to the present Argument. It is as well known that Several of the first *Protestant Bishops*, were named by the *Lay-Power*, as *Succeffors* to *Bishops*, who were deprived solely by that *Lay-Power*. Nor can there be any *Regular Succession* in the *Protestant Church*, whether of *Non-jurors*, or *Others*, but what must come down from those *Bishops*,

shops: whom yet our *Adversaries* must deny to have been *Bishops*, upon the Account of those *Lay-Deprivations*.

Ask our *Adversaries* therefore, first, What should we have done, upon their Principles, for any degree of *Reformation*? Not only, for our *Church of England*, but even for *their own*? To wait for it, in a *Regular* way, from the *Hands* of the *Popish Bishops*, and *Clergy* themselves, in whose Eyes it was worse than *Death*, had been to give Consent to all Superstition, and Wickedness, in expectation of what would never have come to pass. And to have it from any *Hands* but theirs, will, I fear, upon *their* Principles, give a *Nullity* to the *whole*: As this cannot be done, without setting up *Altar* against *Altar*; and one Succession of *Bishops* against *Another*.

But, as we have received from our Fore-fathers a *Reformation*; and have a *Church*, which these *Gentlemen* think so well of, that they will allow no Share of it to *Any* but *Themselves*; talking much of the Succession of their *Bishops*, and the like: Ask them, how we shall decide the matter, (not between *Our selves*, and *Them*, but) between their much Dearer Friends, the *Roman-Catholicks*, and *Them*: Whom they have never yet declared to be *Excommunicated*, or out of *Christ's Church*; or without *Christ's Ordinances*. Where there is *Bishop* against *Bishop*; and *Altar* against *Altar*; the *one* side, or the *other*, they tell you, must be (not only *mistaken*, but) void of all pretenses to the *Privileges* of the *Church of Christ*; or even to the *Name of Church*. Now, the *Papists* have
one

one *Regular Appointment*, or *Uninterrupted Succession* of *Bishops*, undefiled with the *Touch* of *Lay-Hands*: And *They*, according to *Themselves*, have another. By virtue of the former alone, the *Popish Laity* receive the *Authoritative Blessing*; and the *Authoritative Absolution*: And by virtue of the latter, the *People*, in *Communion* with the *Non-jurors*, receive the same good things from their *Priests*. But I have never heard yet, that this present *Popish Church*, in *England*, or *Ireland*, hath been condemn'd by our *Adversaries*, as *No Church*; and all its *Ordinances* declared *Null*; and its *Succession*, *Irregular*, or *Insignificant*. And yet, upon their *Principles*, if the *Appointment* of *Romish Bishops* here be *Regular*; there cannot be *Another*, in opposition to it, *Regular* likewise. If the *Popish Church* here, be a *Church*; then, these new *Protestant Churches*, cannot be truly so. If the *Ordinances* in that be valid and good; the *Ordinances* in their *Own* must be *Null* and *Void*: Because it is set up, *Altar* against *Altar*, and *Church* against *Church*, and *One Succession* of *Bishops*, against *Another*.

The *Advocates* of the *Church* of *Rome*, therefore, are so wise, as to turn these *Principles* of some profess'd *Protestants* to their own *Account*; and delude many weak *Minds*, of such as have been first deluded by our *Nonjurors*, by speaking to them, in this manner. "Your own *Guides*" and *Doctors*, put your *Title* to *God's Favour* upon your adhering to a *Regular Succession* of *Bishops* and *Clergy*; and upon the *Nullity* of *God's Ordinances* to You, in any other Way, set

“ up in *Opposition* to this. They go so far, as to
 “ nullify the *Qualifications* of such as have suc-
 “ ceeded *Bishops*, deprived by the *Lay-Power* on-
 “ ly ; and of such as set up *Altar* against *Altar*,
 “ and *Succession* against *Succession*, where there is a
 “ Church before. Now, their own *Succession* of
 “ *Bishops* is set up, in *Opposition* to *Ours* ; which
 “ is as regular and *uninterrupted* as that was before
 “ the *Reformation*, from which alone they are
 “ willing to derive the *Validity* of their own *Or-*
 “ *dinations*. Their *Altars* are set up against *Ours* ;
 “ their *Churches* against *Ours* : which They have
 “ never yet declared to be *No Churches*. We have
 “ the most regular *Succession*, from which *Theirs*
 “ is a *Deviation*. Therefore, upon *Their own*
 “ Principles, *Ours* is the True Way to God’s Fa-
 “ vour. At least, they must acknowledge, in their
 “ Way of Arguing, that, if you cannot Commu-
 “ nicate with *Us*, you ought to live without the
 “ Appearance of the *Ordinances* of God ; rather
 “ than Communicate with *Them*, who are *Schis-*
 “ *matical*, upon their own Principles, and *Excom-*
 “ *municated* by *Us*. Besides, some of the *Bishops*,
 “ in their own *Line* of *Succession*, all the World
 “ knows, at the beginning, succeeded Those of
 “ *Ours*, who were deprived by the *Civil Power* on-
 “ ly : and therefore, by *Themselves*, must be acknow-
 “ ledged as *Schismatical*, and not to be followed,
 “ without the Forfeiture of God’s Favour”.

When a *Popish Priest* attacks one of the *Fol-*
lowers of our *Nonjurors* with this *Argument* ;
 I profess, I see not how He can possibly answer
 it, without forsaking Their Principles. It is not
 enough

enough for Him to be taught to say that the Bishop of Rome never had any *Rightful Authority* here in this *Island*, to make, or unmake, *Bishops*. For if *that* were sufficient to annul the *Validity* of the *Popish Succession* of *Bishops*, it will as much follow that there was no *Episcopacy*, no *Church*, here, before the *Reformation*, as since: Which these Persons will not, for the World, agree to, because it will render *invalid* their whole *Sett*, and *Succession* of *Clergy*; whose Powers to serve God in *his Church*, they are not content to derive from God's Will, any otherwise than by a *regular Succession* of *Bishops* and *Clergy*. Besides, if their Principles would let them go so far, this would not at all heal, or make up, that *Chasm*, or *Gap*, which is in *their Succession*, by the *Lay-Deprivations*, almost at the beginning of the *Reformation*.

Nor is it enough to affirm, (as Dr. *Hickes*, *Coll. of Papers*, p. 163.) that the *Popish Bishops* are the *Anti-Bishops* to the *Reformed Bishops*, and particularly in *Ireland*, where, (saith he,) if dangerous and corrupting *Doctrines*, and corrupt *Worship*, condemned by the *Protestants*, do not justify the setting up and continuing of other *Bishops*, in every *Diocese* of the *Church*, from the beginning of the *Reformation*, then the *Protestant Bishops* there have been all along *Anti-Bishops*, and by *Consequence* the *Irish Church* (or, the *Church of England*, which is all one to the Argument) is, and hath been, *Schismatical*, &c. or, what He saith, Page 167. speaking of *Anti-Bishops* by *Intrusion*, and *False Doctrine*; viz. such were the *Popish Bishops* in *Queen Mary's Reign*, who were put into

the Sees of the displaced Protestant Bishops, as He thinks, some of them were. These things come not up to the *Point*: nor will they answer our Difficulties. For the Questions here, are these.

Is the *Popish Church* in *Ireland*, a *Church*, or not? Doth *Their* being *Anti-Bishops*, or, their corrupt *Doctrines*, and *Worship*, render *invalid* all their *Administrations* to their own People? If it doth not; then, in some Cases, there may be *Anti-Bishops* without that sad Effect on either side; and *Polluted Worship*, without the dreadful Consequences, which are sometimes set forth. And if the *Romish Pollutions* have not this Effect, even under *Anti-Bishops*; it is to be hoped *Others* may come in, for a *Share* of this Favour. Again,

Are these Cases to be judged of, from *Importance*, and particular *Circumstances*? Then, there is an End of the *Absolute Necessity* of one particular Regularity, in order to God's Favour; and the Dispute must come to *Arguments* of another nature.

Again, Who is to judge of corrupt *Doctrines*, and *polluted Worship*? *They*, who approve of them, and require others to join in them? or, *They*, who are required to approve them, and to join in them? If the former; then, there never was, and never can be, any such thing as *Corrupt Doctrines*, and *Corrupt Worship*, even to justify *Any Protestants* from setting up at first, or continuing afterwards, *Protestant Bishops* in opposition to *Popish*. If the Latter; then, whatever Body of Christians thinks the *Doctrines* and *Worship* of the *Nonjurors* to be *Corrupt* and *Polluted*, is justified, in setting up
and

and continuing *Bishops* and *Clergy*, against *Their* *Bishops* and *Clergy*. Farther,

What is it that justified the *Protestants*, as He acknowledges, in setting up their own *Bishops*? Was it, that the *Popish Doctrines* and *Worship* were actually corrupt; or that the *Protestants* were persuaded in their own Consciences that They were so? The latter, without doubt; as appears from this *Demonstration*. Take away from Them this *Persuasion*; They are so far from being justified, that They are condemn'd for their Departure. Give Them this *Persuasion* again; They are condemn'd, if They do not separate. Or, in another manner, Suppose a *Papist*, not persuaded of that *Corruption*, to separate; He is, for the want of that *Persuasion* alone, condemn'd: Suppose a *Protestant*, or one thoroughly persuaded of that *Corruption*, to separate; and He is justified in so doing; or, not to separate, and He is condemn'd. If this were duly and impartially consider'd, it would be impossible for Men, to *unchristian*, *un-church*, or, declare out of God's Favour, any of their *Fellow Creatures*, upon any lesser, or indeed any other, *Consideration*, than that of a wicked Dishonesty and Insincerity; of which, in these Cases, God alone is Judge.

But here, the *Nonjurors* will tell Us, (as Dissenters from Them, who have set up *Churches* against *Their* (*churches*) that We are condemn'd, unless We can prove their Doctrine, and Worship to be corrupt and polluted; or that any thing sinful is required in their *Communion*. But, To Whom must We prove this? or, To whose Satisfaction?

To

To *their* Satisfaction, who are confident of the *contrary*; and maintain it to be the most undefiled? or, To *our own*, whom They expect to conform to it? This will presently be determined by putting the following Case. The *Nonjurors* separate from the *Popish Bishops*, because of *corrupt Doctrines*, and *polluted Worship*. The *Popish Bishops* tell them, If indeed, any thing *sinful* can be proved to be required of You, in our *Communion*, We acknowledge, You are *justified* in your *Separation*: and This, on the other hand, The *Nonjurors* acknowledge to be the only Point that can justify them. And, therefore, They readily answer, that They can prove this evidently, to the Degree of *Demonstration*. The *Popish Bishops* answer Them, Your *Arguments* are far from proving it to Us; and reply to Them, with equal Assurance, and Confidence of being in the Right. The *Nonjurors*, I am persuaded, will then answer thus. We are not obliged to wait till *You your selves* are convinced. Our Business is to satisfy *our selves*, and not *You*, of the *Unlawfulness* of *Communicating* with You. We have proved it to *our own* entire Satisfaction. And therefore, We are obliged in Conscience to *separate* from You; even tho' We can't convince *You your selves* that our *Arguments* have any Weight in them.

Let this be applied to all *like Cases*: and it will be a certain Rule to go by, that, as the *Nonjurors* themselves allow the *corrupt Doctrines*, and *polluted Worship*, of the *Popish Bishops*, to be the true Ground of their own *Separation*, and setting up *Churches* against *their Churches*; and that They are

are obliged to prove *this*, to *Themselves* only, and not to the Conviction of those *Papish Bishops*; before They set up *Bishops* against Them: So, the *Separation* of Others from the *Nonjuring Bishops*, is as perfectly justified, by the *Honest Perswasion* of Those who separate from Them; whether those *Nonjurors* themselves think their *Reasons* good, or not. Otherwise indeed, *All Parties* are the *sole Judges* in their *own Case*: and the *Papish Party* alone must, in the End, be in the *Right*, because They were in Possession when the first *Separation* of *Protestants* was made: which therefore, can never be justified, if the *Romish Governing Church*, (in the New Phrase,) were the *sole Judge*, whether *Their own Communion* were *sinful*, or not. There are Two good Reasons for making this *Controversy* the *Occasion* of speaking these Things: that our own Church, and every *Protestant Church* in the World, may not be absolutely condemn'd; and that the *Equitable Law* may appear evident beyond all Exception, of Not Judging *Any Others* by a *Rule*, by which *We* always refuse to be judged, *Our selves*.

All this may, methinks, serve to allarm Our *Adversaries* themselves, upon *their own Principles*, about the Danger, *Their Own Church* of *England* is in, by their way of *Proceeding*. And Perhaps, *They*, who seem to have but a very faint *Notion* of the Honour of *God*, and the *Design* of the *Gospel*, any farther than They suppose Them to go hand in hand, with *their own Particular Sect*, and *Church*, may receive the first Impression and Suspicion of their being mistaken, from this manifest *Tendency* of their *own Principles*, to *Unchurch* them-

Themselves; and to reflect back upon their own People and Clergy, that *Excommunication*, and *Damnation*, which They are so freely dispensing abroad, all around them.

But if Any of the *Popish Advocates* should offer such *Arguings* to You, as I mentioned just now; there is the same easy Way of answering Them, which there is, of replying to our *Protestant Adversaries*. You can tell them, that You have not such Notions of God, as to think it consistent with his Nature, to wrap up the most Important of All Points in Clouds of *Obscurity*, and *Uncertainty*; that, in Fact, there must have been frequent *Interruptions* in the *Succession* of the *Christian Clergy*; that the *Gospel* layeth no stress upon *this* Matter, but a great deal of Weight upon things of quite another Nature; that You imitate our *First Reformers*, who Scorn'd to take their *Claim* to the *Purity* of the *Gospel*, from such *Topicks*; that You do not put the Cause of the *Reformation*, and of the *Church of England*, upon such *Trifles*; but upon Your own being sincerely persuaded of the *Necessity* of departing from *Those*, who had departed from God; and destroyed the whole Design of his *Gospel*; that God and *Christ* could not but approve of this, and therefore, could not but approve of *Those* of the *Clergy*, who did at first, and have since, joined in it; that You cannot put either *Their*, or *Your own*, *Eternal Salvation*, upon their *Regular Ordination*, and *Unbroken Succession* from the *Apostles*, because this would be to put it upon the *Invention* of Men, and not the *Declaration* of *Christ*; and indeed, upon what You

You may be very well assured, never was; that, tho' you have all Respect for what is *fitting, Orderly, and Decent*, yet, you cannot in Conscience absolutely depend upon any *Sett of Men* for the *Terms of Salvation*, whilst the *Gospel* it self lies open, without renouncing *Christianity*: nor expect God's *Graces, Benedictions, or Absolutions*, from any Hands, but *his own*; without affronting Him: nor put the *Eternal Happiness* of Mankind, absolutely, upon their agreeing in *One External Communion*, with any *One particular Sett of Clergymen*, without the absurd Supposition that God prefers an *Impossibility* before the *Truest Sincerity* of Heart.

And here, I cannot forbear to mention an *Argument*, which I think amounts to a *Demonstration*, in the strictest sense of the Word, for the *Truth* of what I have now said: And which I would apply now particularly to our *Adversaries* themselves; that they may the better *feel* the force of it, in their own Case. You say, that *God's favour* is not Dispensed, but in the Strict Communion of your particular, little, *Body, or Church*. I am not now going to accuse you of a *Heresy* against *Charity*, as You do the *Donatists*, who had only just the same Uncharitableness, of Adhering to the Consequences of their own Principles: But of a *Heresy* against the very *Possibility, and Nature* of things; or of holding that, which throws Men out of the favour of God, which way soever They act. You know, there was a *Schism* amongst Your selves, upon this Account. Mr. *Nelson*, for instance, thinks Himself

N

obliged

obliged in Conscience to Communicate with some of our Church. Upon this, You declare, He hath no Title to God's Mercy. And You and all the World allow that if He Communicates with You, whilst His *Conscience* tells Him, it is a *Sin*, He is *Self-condemn'd*, and out of God's favour. He is therefore, entitled to God's wrath, both, if He *doth* Communicate with You; and if He *doth not*. That *Notion* therefore, which implies in it, this Great, Invincible Absurdity, cannot be True. And I heartily wish that *All Parties of Christians*, even supposing their own way to be *certainly*, or *infallibly*, the *Right way*, would consider this.

But again, Every one may find it, in his own Conduct, to be true, that his Title to God's favour cannot depend upon his actual being, or continuing, in any particular Method; but upon his *Real sincerity* in the conduct of his Conscience, and of His own Actions, under it. You adhere, for instance, to the *Communion* of the *Non-jurors*. Why? Plainly, *not* because it *is* the *True, Christian, Communion*; (for *that* it may be, in it self, without your adhering to it;) but because, *You judge*, and *esteem* it so to be, upon your most serious Consideration; and conduct your self Sincerely by this dictate of your Conscience. Your Title to God's favour therefore, cannot depend Simply upon your adhering to this *Communion*; because the very adhering to this *Communion*, if it were against your Conscience, would entitle you to His Anger: But must depend upon it, consider'd as a Conduct honestly enter'd into, by the Dictate

Dictate of your Conscience. The favour of God, therefore, follows *Sincerity*, consider'd as such. And consequently, equally follows every *Equal Degree of Sincerity*. If any Persons, rather than agree to be happy, in the company of others, chuse to hazard *their own* Salvation, upon their own *Infalible Certainty*; or the *Salvation of others* upon the Indispensable Obligation of All Men to *See what They see*: I do not *envy* them a *Pleasure*, which hath nothing but *Imagination*, and *Absurdity*, to support it. To return,

Authoritative Benediction is *Another* of the *Terms of Art*, much used by our *Protestant Adversaries*, and *Others* who follow them too closely: in which, They claim a *Right* to the *Clergy*, in one certain *Regular Succession*, of *Blessing* the *People*. If They mean no more by *this*, than that, being appointed, in an orderly manner, to officiate in the *Church*, it is Part of their *Office*, to declare, out of *God's Word*, upon what *Terms*, He will give his *Blessing* to *Christians*; or to express their own hearty *Wishes* and *Prayers* for the *People's* obtaining that *Blessing*; this might be understood. But to claim a *Right* to stand in *God's* *Stead*, in such *Sense*, that *They*, with all their *Infirmities*, and *Prejudices*, and *Mistakes*, about *Them*, can absolutely and certainly, *Bless* some, or with-hold a *Blessing* from *Others*; and that *God Almighty* hath obliged *Himself* to *Bless*, or *not to Bless*, with their *Voice* alone: this is the *Highest Absurdity*, as it puts a *Power*, which nothing but *Infalibility* can support, into the *Hands of Men*, remaining *Weak*, and *Fallible*; and, as I think, the *Highest Blasphemy*.

my, as it supposeth *Almighty God*, to place a *Sett* of *Men*, above *Himself*; and to put out of his own Hands, the Disposal of his own *Blessings* and *Curses*. And here again, the *Papists* find a vast Advantage against their *Protestant Fellow-Labourers*. For if it be true that such a *Power* is dislodged from Heaven, and lodged in the *Hands* of the *Church*; it is a strong *Argument* that *Infallibility* is first lodged there: because *that alone* is sufficient for so great and so important a Trust.

The same You will find a sufficient Reply to their *presumptuous Claim*, to an *Authoritative Absolution*. An infallible *Absolution* cannot belong to *Fallible Men*. But, No *Absolution* can be *Authoritative*, which is not *certainly* to be depended upon; nor *certainly* to be depended upon, which is not *Infallible*. Therefore, No *Authoritative Absolution*, properly so called, can belong to any *Men* living. God Himself hath declared, in His *Gospel*, the *Conditions*, upon which alone, *He* will pardon and accept Those, who have been Sinners: *i. e. absolve* Them. All *Absolution*, therefore, must depend upon Sinners coming up to Those *Conditions*. They are pardon'd, if *They* come up to them: and they are not pardon'd, if they do not. To represent these *Conditions* to the World; and to declare that *All Sinners*, coming up to these *Conditions*, are absolved: This is one Part of the *Office* of *Ministers*; which They may apply to the *Case* of any particular *Penitent*, conditionally. But to assume to *Themselves* the *Power* of *absolving* particular Persons, so that Those particular Persons may depend upon that *Absolution* certainly

certainly, is to assume to Themselves, either a *Right* to dispense with Those Conditions which God himself hath fixed, and to put their *Authoritative Absolution* in the Stead of them; or else, a *Power* of knowing the Hearts and Sincerity of Men, which God alone knows. To assume *this*, without first assuming *Infallibility*, is *Nonsense*: And to assume *Infallibility*, is *Blasphemy*. All *Humane Absolutions* must be *Uncertain*: As *Uncertain* as those *Conditions* in the Person to be *absolved*, upon which it must depend. And therefore cannot be *Authoritative*: because *that Word* is of no *Importance* here, unless it signify something to be depended upon, as *Certain*.

If they amuse You with that *Power* which our *Saviour* lodged with His *Apostles*; *Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted to Them; and whosoever Sins Ye retain, they are retained*; or the like: You may answer securely that it is impossible for You to depend upon this *Right*, in *Them*, as any thing *Certain*, till They prove to You that Every thing spoken to the *Apostles*, belongs to *Ministers* in all Ages of the *Church*. This it is impossible for *Them* to prove. And therefore, it is impossible to draw a certain Conclusion from it. As for the Nature of the thing; It is much more probable that these Words referr'd to something *Extraordinary* and *Supernatural* in the *Apostles*, for the Propagation of the *Gospel*, at first, than to any thing, in the ordinary settled Condition of the *Church*. And tho' it be supposed that We cannot fix the true plain Meaning of this *Text*; yet, (which is the next best thing, and of equal Importance, with respect to the present *Controversy*;) We can certainly

tainly fix, what is *not* the Meaning of it. For, Whatsoever contradicts the Natural Notions of God, and the Design and Tenour of the Gospel, cannot be the *True Meaning* of any Passage in that Gospel. But, to make the *Absolutions* of Weak, Fallible Men, so *necessary*, or, so *valid*, that God will not pardon any *without* them, and that *All* are *pardon'd*, who have them pronounced over them; is to contradict those *Notions*, as well as the plain *Tenour* of the Gospel: which expressly declareth Men to be in God's Favour upon their forsaking their Sins, and as expressly continues to *Almighty God* the *Disposal* of His *Own Favours*, upon his own *Terms*, which was always His *Prerogative*. Therefore, It cannot be the True Intent of this *Passage* now before Us, to give any such *Power* to Men.

If we look back upon our *Saviour Himself*, we shall find that, when He declares in the Gospel that the *Son of Man* had *Power upon Earth* to forgive Sins, even He himself either meant by it, the Power of a miraculous Releasing the Man from his *Affliction*, (which was look'd upon as the *Punishment* of Sin;) or, if it related to another more spiritual Sense of the Words, the Power of declaring only that the Man's Sins were forgiven by God. By his *supernatural Knowledge*, (not by that which belong'd to Him, as a *mere Man*,) He knew that God was going to shew Mercy to the Man. But his way of Expression was, *Thy Sins are forgiven Thee*. This was plainly to acknowledge, and keep up, that true Notion, that God alone forgiveth Sins. And our

Saviour

Saviour, knowing the Case of the Man there spoken to, assured Him of God's Forgiveness. *His Sins were forgiven by God.* And the Son of Man's Power to forgive Sins upon Earth, was plainly to declare this to Him, of whom He certainly and infallibly knew it to be true. And so, to any Others. This arose, you see, wholly from his *infallible Knowledge* of the Will of God, with respect to that particular Person; and could have had no Place in our Lord himself, had He been a mere Man, without any *infallible Knowledge in Himself*, or *Communication of Knowledge* from God, concerning His Will, and Favour to this Man, or to other Men.

Thus, the Apostles, likewise, might possibly understand the *Power of remitting and retaining Sins*, to be the same with that *Power of laying their Hands upon the Sick*, to which a miraculous Recovery was particularly promised by Christ. Or, supposing that they applied it to the certain Absolution of particular Persons (of which we read nothing, as I know of;) it is plain, They could do it upon no other bottom but this, that God's Will, and Good Pleasure, about such particular Persons, was *infallibly* communicated to Them; and that They declared This Will about Those particular Persons. Not that They themselves absolved any Men; or hinder'd them from being absolved by God; Not that God was obliged to tie, and untie; to bind and to loose, the Guilt of Men, according to their Declarations, consider'd as Their own Decisions, and Their own Determinations: But that, upon any such Occasion, They declared a Matter of

of *Fact*, infallibly made known to them by God; either that He was ready to bestow his Mercy upon such and such particular Persons, or that He was angry with Them. This can be the only *Meaning* of that Passage, supposing it to relate to *Absolution*. It must arise from extraordinary Communications of Knowledge from God; and consequently, cannot relate, in the same sense, to any *Sett* of Men, in the ordinary state of the *Church*, void of such Communications of *Infallible Knowledge*, as could be, even in the *Apostles*, the only foundation of any supposed *Authoritative Absolution*.

But *All* that it can possibly convey to Any, who succeed the *Apostles* in their *Spiritual Office*, supposing it to relate to this subject, is a *Right* to do their *Duty*; to declare Persons *Absolved* from their *Sins* by God, so far, and no farther than, as They come up to *Those Conditions*, upon which our Lord hath himself fixed their *Acquittance*, or *Justification*. This is *All* that a *Fallible Man*, in the highest Office in this World, is capable of: And ought to be more to his Satisfaction, than to have in *his Power*, the *Authoritative Disposal* of the *Salvation* or *Damnation*, of his *Fellow Creatures*. But *They*, who are first *Infallible*, may certainly claim the Power of what is here called *Authoritative Absolution*. And therefore, it is very Consistent in the *Church of Rome*, if They are resolved to have the *latter*, to suppose and claim the *former*: Which may undoubtedly be claimed, wherever the *other* is allowed to be.

The

The *Result* of the Whole, is this. God is true, and Just, and Good. The *Gospel* is a plain Declaration of his Will. He cannot put the Eternal Salvation of his Creatures upon any thing, but what He puts in their Power to do, and to be satisfied about. He cannot put into the Hands of weak fallible Men, *Privileges* and *Powers*, which cannot be exercised as they ought to be, without *Infallibility*. He reserves to Himself the Authoritative Dispensation of his *Favour*, and of his *Anger*, to his *Creatures*, whose Hearts no one knows but Himself, upon his *own* Terms: for which He hath appointed a Day, in which He himself will judge the World. From all which it follows, that the Benefits of his *Ordinances*, his *Benediction*, his *Absolution*, are in his own Hands; come from himself; and cannot depend upon *Regularities*, and *Niceties*, impossible, or improbable; but are dispensed by *Him*, according to the inward Dispositions, and *Qualifications* of *Them*, who wait for them: that this is so far from leaving *You*, of the *Christian* Laity, to any *undue Freedom* and *Latitude*, (as it is sometimes objected,) that it layeth the highest Obligation upon *You* to use all your Sincerity, to know God's Will, and your utmost Endeavours to perform it; that it puts your *Happiness* upon *this*, because nothing else is certain, and because consequently nothing else can give you Support, or Comfort; that this will be so far from leading *You* to disregard the *Peace*, and *Unity* of *Christians*, that it will make *You* conscientiously solicitous about it, and resolved to prefer nothing before it, except *Purity* and *Conscience*:

ence : but, when you are secure of Your *Integrity* before God, and of your sincere Disposition to search after His Will, and to receive the Truth, in the love of Truth, whensoever, and from whomsoever it is offer'd ; this will, I confess, lead You, (as it ought, all of Us,) not to be afraid of the *Terrors* of Men, or the *vain Words* of, *Regular* and *Uninterrupted Successions* ; *Authoritative Benedictions*, *Excommunications*, or *Absolutions* ; *Nullity*, or *Validity*, of God's *Ordinances* to the People, upon account of *Niceties* and *Trifles* ; or any other the like *Dreams* of Those who have *separated Themselves*, or of Those who follow Them in these *Doctrines* ; or indeed, any thing but what He, who is Your *Lord*, and *Master*, and *Judge*, hath Himself declared that Your *Salvation* shall depend upon. And as I am sure, that it is *Upright* and *Honest*, to speak thus plainly ; and to inculcate this upon You : So I am as sure, it is the only certain Method of preventing, or expelling the Poison of Those who are gone out from Us, because they were not of Us ; and will, in the End, prove the only *Effectual Method*, of preserving this *Protestant Christian Church*, (which it self directs it's Members to the *Holy Scriptures* as their sole *Infallible*, or *Authoritative Guide*,) and of making it a *Praise* in the whole *Earth*.

To conclude, As this *Controversy* respects our present *Civil Constitution* ; as well as Our *Church*, and that *Gospel* upon which it hath expressly founded All it's own *Pretensions*, and all the *Religion* of it's Members ; nothing is wanting towards your right judging, in every Part of it, but a
serious

serious Application of your Minds, to some few *Common Uncontested Principles* of Civil Government; and to the plain and express Declarations of the *Gospel* it self. The *One* will teach You the *Extent* of Civil Government to every thing necessary for it's Preservation; and the *Evident Right* of our *Illustrious Royal Family* to the *Throne* of these *Kingdoms*; which will add *Zeal* to your *Submission*; and the *Other* will teach You the *Extent* of the *Office* of the *Christian Clergy*, as well as Your own *Duty*; and above all, Your *Right* to God's *Graces*, *Absolution*, and *Benediction*, upon the *Conditions* of *Him*, who offers Them to You, without any regard to the *Outcries* of Humane *Terror*, or the *Solemn Denunciations* of any Men upon Earth.

It is both your *Duty* and your *Interest* to study these *first Principles* of all Truth; and *Christianity* in it's first Simplicity. The most *Important Points* are so plain, that they will cost you no more *Time*, than what is necessary to *One* serious Consideration of them. *All*, that mean truly, and honestly, the Happiness of the Nation; or the Benefit of *Christ's Church* and *People*; will both encourage and applaud Your *Enquiry*. I have endeavoured, for my part, to go before You; and to point out the *Way* to the *Main Parts* of it. And when You are once *Masters* of *Them*, They are full of such *Consequences*, as will be of vast *Advantage* to You at *all* times; but, particularly, at *this* time, will make you able not only to oppose, but to overthrow, all, even the most *Learned Artifices* made use of by our *Adversaries*, for the Support and Propagation, of their Cause.

In all your *Civil Concerns*, the *Publick Good*; the *Peace*, the *Happiness*, of that *Society* to which You belong, will easily, and safely conduct You, both to know, and to do, the Will of God. In all Your *Religious Concerns*, that affect Your *Eternal Salvation*, and Your *Title to God's Favour*, Your *Rule* is plain, and evident. *Christ* is Your sole Law-giver, and Your sole Judge, as to those Points. The *Papists* may *Excommunicate* the *Protestant Nonjurors*. The *Nonjurors* may *Excommunicate* the *High-Church-Men*, as well as All other *British Protestants*, who Pray for King *GEORGE*. These again may *Excommunicate*, *Unchurch*, *Unchristian*, Those, whose *Church-Government*, or *Worship*, differ from their own. And These again, may exercise the same *Spiritual Discipline*, wherever their *Terrors* can extend themselves. They may thus scatter *Damnation* about; playing, one would think, as the *Man* in the *Proverbs*, with *Firebrands*, and *Death*, and saying, *Are We not in Sport?* And they may every one, flatter *Themselves* that this *Power of the Keys* shuts out from the *Catholick Church* here, and from the *Kingdom of Heaven* hereafter. But it is in truth, only from *Themselves*, that They can *Excommunicate*: And this is very often their own *Crime*, and their own *Loss*. But *Christ* himself, and His *Apostles*, have plainly told you, *what* it is, and *what* alone, that shall cut You off from *Him*; and declared a *Curse* upon *All* who *Preach any other Gospel*: and consequently, who add any thing, as absolutely necessary to His *Favour*, which *He* hath not made so.

It is therefore, Your *Duty*, Your *Privilege*, and Your *Interest*, to observe *Those Passages* in the *New Testament*, in which the *Genius*, and *Great Design*, of the *Gospel*, is *purposely* express'd ; and *Those*, in which it is *purposely* and expressly declared, upon what sort of things, *Christ* will acquit, or condemn You, at the last Day. They were written for You, and they need no *Interpreter*. Remember always that, *These* being plain, there can be *nothing* intended in any obscurer Passage of *Scripture*, inconsistent, or disagreeable to *These* : much less, that *Any* of the *Pretenses*, or consequential Arguings of *Men* ; or any *Precedents* and *Examples* of *Men* after the *Apostles*, tho' never so *Pious*, or *Great* ; can have any Weight against, or equal to, Them. *These* will be your safe, and unmoveable *Retreat*. And whilst you adhere to *them*, you will ever be sure that not the least Tittle of Your Salvation, or Damnation, depends upon the *Will* of *Weak Men* ; but *All* upon God and Your Selves : that *Humane Benedictions* ; *Humane Absolutions* ; *Humane Denunciations* ; *Humane Excommunications*, have nothing to do with the *Favour* or *Anger* of God ; and that *Every one of Us*, (which is the Un-speakable and indeed the only Comfort of All Sincere and Upright Minds,) is to give an *Account* of *Himself*, (after All these *Humane Engines* have work'd as long as Providence permits them,) to God, our Father, who knows the Thoughts of Men ; and *Jesus Christ*, his Beloved Son, to whom it is peculiarly reserv'd, to bring to light the hidden things of *Darkness*, and to make manifest the *Counsels* of the *Heart*.

As

As for *Your selves*, therefore, *Stand fast in that Liberty, with which God, and Christ, have made You free.*

And as for Our *Adversaries*, If all that can be said, tho' from the most evident *Principles*, cannot convince their Consciences, or alter their Conduct, nothing remains, I think, but to assure Them that We have an *Illustrious Royal Family*, who both Understand and Value their *Right* to the *British Crown*: Whom neither the *Flattery* of *False Friends*, nor the *Terror* of *Real Enemies*, can move, either from a Sacred Regard to their People's *Legal Rights* and *Liberties*; or from a steadfast Asserting and Maintaining their own *Legal Powers* and *Prerogatives*.



BOOKS *Written by the Right Reverend BENIAMIN,*
Lord Bishop of Bangor, and Printed for James
Knapton, at the Crown in St. Paul's Church-
Yard.

THE *Measures of Submission* to the Civil Magistrate consider'd. In a defense of the Doctrine delivered in a Sermon, preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens, of *London*, Sep. 29. 1705. The Fourth Edition. In which are added, 1. An *Accession-Sermon*, preached March 8. 1704-5. 2. A Sermon concerning the *Unhappiness of Absolute Monarchy*, &c. 3. A Sermon concerning *St. Paul's Behaviour* towards the *Civil Magistrate*. pr. 3s.

The Original, and Institution, of *Civil Government*, Discuss'd; viz. I. An *Examination* of the *Patriarcal Scheme* of Government. II. A *Defence* of Mr. *Hooker's Judgment*, &c. against the *Objections* of several late *Writers*. To which is added, A Large Answer to Dr. *F. Atterbury's Charge* of *Rebellion*: In which the *Substance* of his late *Latin Sermon* is produced, and fully examined. The Second Edition. pr. 5s.

Several Discourses concerning the Terms of Acceptance with God. In which, 1. The Terms themselves are distinctly laid down; as they are proposed to Christians in the New Testament. And, 2. Several false Notions of the Conditions of Salvation considered. And particularly, Of being saved by Faith. Of trusting to external Performances. Of the Power of Charity to cover Sins.

Sin. Of relying upon the Merits of Christ. Of Man's Weakness, and God's Grace. Of Repentance. Of the Example of the Thief on the Cross. Of trusting to a Death-bed Sorrow. Of the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard. Of depending upon Amendment in Time to come. p. 5s.

The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England: In two Parts: With the Defence of it, and the *Persuasive to Lay Conformity*. The Third Edition. To which is added, the brief Defense of *Episcopal Ordination*. Together with the *Reply to the Introduction to the Second Part*; and a *Postscript* relating to the Third Part, of Mr. Calamy's Defense of *Moderate Nonconformity*. p. 6s.

Several Tracts formerly Published: Now collected into one Volume. viz. 1. A Letter to the Reverend Mr.

Fleetwood, concerning Miracles. Written, A. D. 1702.

2. A Letter about the *Bishops* Votes; upon the Occasional Bill. 1703. 3. A Letter to the Reverend Dr.

Francis Atterbury, concerning *Virtue*, and *Vice*. 1706.

4. A Second Letter, in Answer to his Large Vindication. 1708. 5. A Vindication of the *Ancient Prop-*

hets, in Answer to Sir R. B. 1709. 6. Some Considerations offered to the Lord *Bishop of Exeter*. 1709.

7. An Humble Reply to the Lord *Bishop of Exeter*. 1709. 8. Queries to the Authors of the late Discourse

of *Free Thinking*. 1713. To which are added, Six Sermons, never before Publish'd: viz. Two Sermons concerning the Evils, of which Christianity hath been made the Occasion, Four Sermons concerning the Extreams of Implicit Subjection, and Infidelity. pr. 6s.

The Present Delusion of Many Protestants, Consider'd. In a Sermon Preach'd in the Parish-Church of *St. Peters Poor*, in *Broadstreet*, November 5. 1715. The 4th Edition.

The Restoration made a Blessing to Us, by the *Protestant Succession*. A Sermon Preached before the King at the Royal Chapel at *St. James's*, on the 29th of *May*, 1716. The Second Edition. pr. 4d.

These Three last Printed for *James Knapton*, and *Timothy Childe*.

